

Roman Catholic Service be used; and finally, that the faithful present at these Eucharistic Services receive Communion from a priest *not* of their own Church," as a sign of the new unity that exists and a cause of the deep unity to come."

What Jesuit Echlin is advocating, if I read him correctly, is "Communicatio in Sacris" before dogmatic union is established by the two now separate Churches, a view which I am afraid his Church will discourage. Vatican II in the Decree of Ecumenism formally promulgated that the teaching "concerning the Lord's Supper and other Sacraments between the separated Churches and Ecclesial Communities in the West, be the subject of the dialogue" while at the same time exhorting the faithful "to refrain from any superficiality and imprudent zeal which can hinder the real progress toward unity." The author in his zeal mistakenly labors under the Anglican way of "comprehensiveness" which is diametrically opposed to the "exclusiveness" of his Church.

Nevertheless the study is valuable and may prove helpful to the coming dialogue between the Roman Catholics and Anglicans, and perhaps to other Christians who quest for unity in the "breaking of bread."

GEORGE J. TSOMAS  
Hellenic College

EDWARD LEROY LONG, JR., *A Survey of Christian Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967. Pp. 342. \$6.50.

The present volume is an attempt to systematize the whole range of contemporary ethical discussion as familiar to the Western world. The author begins with a survey of the place of ethics in the contemporary secular milieu, with emphasis in philosophy and the social sciences, and follows this by relating religion, morality, and Christian ethics. The body of the book is divided into two major concerns, (1) the formulation of the ethical norm and (2) the implementation of ethical decisions. The conceptual tool used to handle the vast array of material is the idea of the "motif," generally unified patterns of approach by which the data of Christian ethics is handled. Long sees three such "motifs" as Christians have sought to work out the ethical implications of the Christian faith as a norm or standard for Christian living. The deliberative motif places the emphasis on the concept of Reason; here "deliberative and rational judgments are used to formulate the ethical norm" (p. 45). Aquinas, scholastic theology, and Kantian-influenced Protestant thought, with their emphasis on the primacy of reason, are first discussed. This then is followed by a discussion of Harnack, Knudson, Garrod, Osborn, Ramsey, and Reinhold Niebuhr, who are seen as appropriating to the ends of Christian ethical discourse aspects of philosophical discourse.

The second motif is the prescriptive motif, which sets the Christian ethical endeavor in a pattern of rules or codes. The biblical background and the approach to it from the prescriptive points of view of such scholars as Dodd, Wycliff, Calvin, John Murray, and Carl Henry are first delineated. The code approaches in the Apostolic Fathers, medieval Canon Law, Henry

Davis (Roman Catholic), Puritanism, and Quaker morality, are discussed, as parts of the ongoing Christian tradition are examined. A final aspect of the prescriptive motif is considered in which legalism and code morality is modified into a realistic casuistry from general principle on one hand and moralities of imitation on the other. Kenneth Kirk and T. H. Oldham, John Bennett and some ecumenical movement ethics represent the first, while à Kempis, John Wesley, and some of Kierkegaard represent the second.

The third motif is the relational motif, in which "the direction of action is shaped by the sense of excitement or gratitude which arises from live, dynamic, and compelling encounter with the source of moral guidance" (p. 117). Understandings of biblical ethics as relational are examined here, with the subsequent responses of persons such as Augustine, Luther, Jonathan Edwards, Nygren Nels Ferré, and Sittler. The use of this relational approach in conjunction with divine command is treated by Brunner, Barth, Bonhoeffer, and Bultmann, and in conjunction with the community and context by Lebmann, Fletcher, Kaufman, Gustafson and others.

The first major concern was to outline the major motifs (deliberative, with its emphasis on law; and relational with its interpersonal character) which serve to establish the norm or standard for defining the good.

The second major concern is the attempt to outline the major approaches used to implement the external decision. Here again three motifs are discussed. The first is the institutional motif, which Long sees as a clearly defined aspect of the "Church Type" defined by Troeltsch which places its emphasis on the order and structure in society. The second is another clearly defined aspect of Troeltsch's "Church Type," that is, the operational motif, which thinks rather in terms of fluid power relationships in society and directs its concern to marshalling the necessary pressures for the purpose of realizing chosen moral values or norms. He lucidly delineates these two types or motifs in page 168.

In the third motif, he feels that Troeltsch's distinctions of sect type and mystical type no longer hold, that they have converged and may properly be considered together under the name "intentional motif" (cf. p. 168).

Examples of the institutional motif are found in the Roman Catholic traditions emphasizing aspects of St. Augustine's writings and St. Thomas Aquinas, as well as certain papal encyclicals. Protestant traditions in the institutional motif are traced in the Lutheran and Calvinistic heritages and others. Finally, early "Social Gospel theologies, which were cast in Institutional forms with an attitude antithetical to power" are considered. Writers who minimized or denied the role of power in the implementation of ethical decisions are treated here. They include Newman Smyth, George D. Herron, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Walter G. Muelder.

An alternative approach to the implementation of ethical decision, rather than placing the priority on the institution, emphasizes, rather, the need of power to establish order. This is referred to as the operational motif in Christian ethics. The emphasis upon superior force and influ-

ence for the realization of ethical goals is a motif in the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr. Power, as an issue of importance for Christian ethics, is subject to discussion from many points of view. Authors who have concerned themselves with this issue and who are given some treatment are Kenneth W. Thomson, Ernest W. Lefever, William Muehl, Alan Geyes, and Albert Rasmussen. The handling of power by the advocates of non-violence and pacifism also receives treatment in this section. The opinions of Martin Luther King, Richard B. Gregg, and Guy F. Hershberger are considered here. The ecclesiastical uses of power then come under scrutiny. The relationship of the Western Church and State in the Investiture Controversy between Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany, and the later controversy between the forces of incipient nationalism and the Western Church pin-pointed in the exchanges between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip the Fair of France as well as the studies of Church power and influence in the United States by authors such as Liston Pope, Kenneth W. Underwood, Eugene Ebersole, and Paul M. Harrison are studies that conclude the examination of the operational motif.

The final motif in the approach to the implementation of ethical decisions treated by the author is what is called the intentional motif. Perhaps this section is most of all indebted to Ernst Troeltsch's categories, it being almost a restatement of that scholar's treatment of the sect-type. Monasticism, and Church-related renewal groups within the Church, are first examined; this is followed by a discussion of sectarian movements including those communal ones which are specifically American in origin, such as the Shakers and the Ephrata Community. Included in the study are the Mennonites, Quakers, and other special emphasis groups such as Moral Re-armament.

The book concludes with a section entitled "Analysis Evaluation," in which an appeal is made for a broader and more inclusive Christian ethic. In the process he focuses on the intra-Christian polemical practices in the field of ethics.

Professor Long has provided us with a unique contribution in the literature of Christian ethics. The categories and over-view which he has devised help professional and student alike grasp the issues which divide Christians on many, if not most, areas of ethical concern. The sharp delineation, however useful, should not be taken as absolute. The revision of Troeltsch's categories is useful, however, exactly because it points to the fact that overly simple categories have a way of breaking down under scrutiny. Perhaps the most constructive aspect of this study is to be found in the author's plea for a Christian ethic which will be comprehensive enough to include all of the areas of concern both theoretically and tactically now treated by the various "motifs" considered. The author calls this the need for a "comprehensive complementarity" in which the tension of claims of each motif upon the other is not viewed as a field for polemics, but as an area for self-correction and balance.

Perhaps it is too much to ask, however, but the next step does seem to be the need for a synthesis in which each motif will find itself in an

organic theoretical and practical relationship with every other motif. Or is this liable to provide us simply with another motif?

STANLEY HARAKAS  
Hellenic College

ISTITUTO PER LE SCIENZE RELIGIOSE DI BOLOGNA, *Testi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose, Indices Verborum et Locutionum Decretorum Concilii Vaticani II*, n° 3, *Constitutio Dogmatica de Ecclesia, Lumen Gentium*. Florence: Vallecchi Editore, 1968. Pp. xi and 224. \$6.00. And ——— *idem*, n° 5, *Decretum de Oecumenismo, Unitatis Redintegratio*. Florence: Vallecchi Editore, 1968. Pp. x and 83. \$2.90.

These two volumes of *Indices* on the conciliary texts of Vatican II, prepared by the Institute of Religious Sciences in Bologna, Italy, represent a scholarly work which can be helpful to both churchmen and scholars.

The Director of the Institute, Dr. Joseph Alberigo, Professor of the University of Bologna, gives a short preface to each volume, followed by the official texts of the conciliary documents, and an exhaustive inventory of the words and expressions used in these texts. Finally, tables of the scriptural, patristic, and other quotations complete the work.

In the preface (in Latin, pp. vii-ix) of the volume on the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium*, Prof. Alberigo refers to the work of the Institute preceding Vatican II, a volume of about eight hundred pages containing the decrees of the "previous ecumenical councils." This volume was published by the Institute as a contribution to the preparation of the Second Vatican Council. The *Indices*, the most recent work of the Institute, are intended to be contributions for a better understanding of the conciliary texts, and, consequently, for a better use of the decrees of the Council in the effort of renewal of the Roman Catholic Church. The purpose of the Institute is to offer "an inventory as analytical and as objective as possible of the texts of the Council, giving a knowledge of the order and composition of each of the conciliary decrees, and, at the same time, making their comparison both accurate and convenient" (p. viii).

The previous systematic inventories, being incomplete, made imperative this edition of the Institute. Those inventories during the interim are easy to consult. However, they do present the danger of omitting many useful elements, and especially the danger of a variety of opinions and arbitrariness. An exception is the "*Index Verborum*" by X. Ochoa (Rome, 1967). This *Index* is very accurate and useful, but has the inconvenience of giving a short context to the words used. Thus, it is necessary to refer to the conciliary texts in order to get the full meaning of the words. Compared to this one-volume *Index*, the *Indices* of the Institute give an ample context of the single words. This makes the sentence fully understandable, without having to consult the text. The author of the Preface is most justified in saying, "There are two advantages to this: first, a rapid inventory of similar locutions can be made, and second, a summary of a



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ARCHIBALD M. HUNTER, *According to John. The New Look at the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968. Pp. 128. \$1.65.

As indicated by the sub-title borrowed from J. A. T. Robinson's paper to the Oxford Conference on the Four Gospels in 1957, A. M. Hunter seeks to present in his short but comprehensive book the "new look" at the Gospel According to St. John. Unlike the old look of the radical scholars of thirty or forty years ago who so minimized the historical worth of the Fourth Gospel that they regarded it as "in the main fiction," the "new look" has largely reversed this with a new emphasis on the historical worth and reliability of the Gospel of St. John. A. M. Hunter contends that the scholarly labor of the past thirty years has brought on some very basic changes of opinion regarding the Fourth Gospel. Specifically these changes constitute the "new look" and may be summarized in the following positions: (a) John is not dependent on the Synoptics; he preserves an independent and early oral tradition existing originally in Aramaic and as near the Synoptics to the historical truth about Jesus. (b) John's essential background is Palestinian as shown by the Dead Sea scrolls. (c) John is not only a witness to the Christ of faith; he is often as near to the Jesus of history as are the Synoptics and sometimes nearer. Moreover the Johannine sayings of Jesus are generally regarded as resting on "words of the Lord," revealing the person and work of Christ in depth. (d) John does not necessarily depend on his great predecessors, like Paul, for his advanced theology simply because he himself is a mature and independent theological thinker living within the experience and the ongoing life of the early Christian community. All these points, of course, have created a new confidence in the Fourth Gospel as an historical source.

The factors which have influenced this new trend are textual, linguistic, archaeological, documentary, etc. For example, new papyrus finds prove that the Fourth Gospel was circulating in Egypt about A.D. 130, and must have been written no later than A.D. 100. C. F. Burney's argument that the Fourth Gospel is a straight translation from an Aramaic original was ruled out by Matthew Black's persuasive argument that John was an Aramaic speaker who wrote his gospel in Greek. Not long ago scholars held a poor view of John's topography, suggesting that he had no accurate knowledge of the terrain and that his details of locality were not to be trusted. The spade of the archaeologist over the past thirty years has revealed the accuracy of John's topography. Archaeological finds such as the Dead Sea scrolls have shed much light on John's conceptual background, i.e. the ethical and eschatological (rather than metaphysical) dualism which finds its best parallels in the Qumran documents. Finally, the question of gospel documents and John's dependence on them has been climaxed by C. H. Dodd's *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, which argues that John was not only independent of the Synoptics but had at his disposal a very early Palestinian oral tradition about Jesus.

A. M. Hunter also discusses "The Course of the Ministry in St. John," "The Miracles of St. John," "The Parables of St. John's Gospel," and "The Sayings of Jesus in St. John." In each case it is made clear that much of the Gospel Tradition in the Fourth Gospel is historically reliable and

trustworthy, and as such is complementary to and an enrichment of the Synoptic tradition.

Perhaps the most original aspect of Hunter's book is the discussion of the parables in St. John's Gospel. Here the author has actually isolated and commented on no less than thirteen however brief passages which he regards as rightly belonging to the category of parable, thus giving more significant indications that the tradition in the Fourth Gospel is really not so unlike that in the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, the parables of the Fourth Gospel, like those in the Synoptic Gospels, serve as a veiled self-testimony of Jesus. It is also very interesting to see how A. M. Hunter, by playing on the words "author" and "authority," can unreservedly state that St. John the Apostle was the *source* and *authority* and thus the real "author" of the ancient tradition behind the Gospel (though he believes that perhaps it was John the Elder, a close disciple of John the Apostle, who actually wrote down the tradition behind the Fourth Gospel which was edited and revised by other disciples). Finally, the book is marked by a sincere appreciation of the profound theology and the existential challenge of the Fourth Gospel *par excellence* of life and of personal communion with God through Christ.

As a whole there is much in A. M. Hunter's book, as in current New Testament research, that is fresh, spiritually and intellectually stimulating, and truly an advance, especially the new emphasis on history in general and the recognition of the historical reliability of the Fourth Gospel. Obviously, of course, this "new look" at the Fourth Gospel is really an extension of the so-called "new quest for the historical Jesus." Preferable as this "new look" might be to the "old look" of the radical scholars, there still remains a rather desperate effort to distinguish sharply between the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith, a practice which inevitably leads to the separation of the inseparable and the division of the indivisible.

PETER A. CHAMBERAS  
*Hellenic College*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[All books received are listed here whether they are reviewed or not.]

GREGORY, ROBERT LLOYD, *Rays of Hope: The Universe—Life—Man* (New York City: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1969). Pp. xiv & 254, \$7.00.

HARRINGTON, WILFRID J., *Understanding the Apocalypse* (Washington, D.C.: Corpus Pubs., 1969). Pp. ix & 278, \$5.95.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

JOHN KARMIRIS, *Additions to the Dogmatic and Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (in Greek), reprint from the second edition. Athens, 1967. Pp. 77.

The two-volume *Mnemeia* of Professor John Karmiris of the University of Athens School of Divinity has been received with the greatest acclaim since its appearance in 1952-1953. By now it is a classic—the most comprehensive collection of universally acknowledged dogmatic and symbolic documents of the Orthodox Catholic Church throughout its long historical development. True to the author's intention, this collection has been used by Orthodox and non-Orthodox alike as a source of valid texts which reflect the inner life of the Orthodox Church and its "ecumenical" self-awareness. By its very nature the collection is open-ended; because of the need for certain revisions and supplements to the original publication, the author has updated his work. Additions and revisions were made in both volumes, the former being re-edited in Athens (1962) and the latter in Gratz, Austria, by the Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt (1967). The present reprint under review contains the additions to the second volume in its second edition of 1967.

The supplementary and additional material is to be included in Chapter Four, "Later Dogmatic-Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church," which contains the statements of the post-Byzantine and contemporary times. The author preserves his original rigid distinction between the strict Creeds of the Orthodox Church, which have absolute, authoritative, and binding authority, and those of a secondary, derivative, and relative character, which nevertheless are of great theological value insofar as they express the true spirit of the one continuous Orthodox faith. The supplement and additions are all in this latter category. In some cases they replace previous subheadings, in others they supplement the existing material and in still others they are additions to it. These are eight in number, as follows:

XXII. The Definition (Horos) of the Local Synod in Constantinople of 1872 against Phyletism.

XXIV. The Patriarchal and Synodal Encyclical of 1902 concerning the interrelations of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches and other general subjects and the Response of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the Replies of the Orthodox Churches (1902-1904).

XXVI. The Encyclical of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Orthodox Declarations relative to the Ecumenical Movement of the Churches (1920-1961). . . . 6. Declarations of the Orthodox Delegation at Evanston (1954). 7. Declaration of the Orthodox Delegation before the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi, India (1961).

XXVII. The Agenda of the future Panorthodox Prosynod prepared by the First Panorthodox Conference of Rhodes (1961).

XXVIII. The Orthodox Catholic Church in dialogue with the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches. The Decisions of the Second and Third Panorthodox Conferences of Rhodes (1963-1964) and

the Meeting of the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople in Jerusalem (1964).

XXIX. The Orthodox Catholic Church in dialogue with the Ancient Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East (1965).

XXX. The Lifting of the Anathemas of 1054 by the Churches of Rome and Constantinople (1965).

XXXI. The Decisions of the Fourth Panorthodox Conference of Belgrade concerning the subjects of theological dialogue between the Orthodox Catholic Church and the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches (1966).

In any undertaking of such magnitude and breadth there is bound to be a certain degree of personal predilection. One cannot avoid making personal judgments about what might have been included. It appears to this reviewer, however, that several other relevant items could have been added. For instance, the replies of the sister Autocephalous Churches to the 1902 Patriarchal and Synodal Encyclical — particularly that of the Church of Russia which had evidenced the greatest possible concern and interest in Christian reunion and internal reforms during this period — would have been very helpful.

The Orthodox Declarations at Evanston and New Delhi are presented without the usual informative commentary or introduction. Such background would be most valuable and instructive, especially in the case of New Delhi, where the issue of a separate Declaration or Contribution aroused so much difference of opinion (cf. John Kalogirou, "The General Assembly of the World Council of Churches at New Delhi," in *Gregorios O Palamas*, 45 [1962], p. 5 ff. [in Greek]; and Gerassimos Konidaris, "The Orthodox Contribution in the Section on Unity in New Delhi. Introductory Note," in *Theologia*, 33 [1962], pp. 183-187).

The Orthodox Declaration at the North American Study Conference on Faith and Order at Oberlin, Ohio (September 3-9, 1957), although a regional conference, certainly expresses with the greatest clarity and precision the Orthodox position on the nature of the unity we seek. This Orthodox statement is on a par with, if not qualitatively better than, the other Declarations presented at ecumenical Assemblies.

Finally, in light of the Aarhus (1964) and Bristol (1967) Consultations between the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Theologians, where great strides have been made in recognizing the agreements on the most delicate doctrinal questions, but where, surprisingly for many, "questions of Church law, mutual recognition of Saints, local church autonomy, and the recognition of the main Ecumenical Councils will be difficult subjects to tackle" (N. A. Nissiotis, *The Bristol Consultation*, July 25-29, 1967, in the *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XIII/2, Fall, 1968, p. 128), perhaps some provision could have been made to include the conclusions in the Report of the theological conversations at Kottayam, India, October 24, 1953 through March, 1954, between the Malabar and Orthodox theologians, in which many of these problems were anticipated.

The *Mnemeia* is an indispensable source book for the appreciation of the Orthodox Church's unbroken continuity through the ages and a sure

guide to the unfolding ecumenical dialogue of the Churches. The 1952-1953 edition received the award of the Academy of Athens for "its comprehensive scholarly appearance," an element which is constantly in evidence in all the work of Professor Karmiris. Our deepest gratitude to him for this supplementary addition to his *Mnemeia*.

ROBERT G. STEPHANOPOULOS

*Rye, New York*

PANAGIOTIS BRATSIOTIS, *The Greek Orthodox Church*. Translated by Joseph Blenkinsopp. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968. Pp. xi, 120. \$5.95. 56 s.

The Roman Catholic Church press has been hospitable to Greek Orthodox theologians in providing them with a sounding board for their views to Western Christianity. The University of Notre Dame Press has extended this opportunity to one of the leading lay theologians of the Greek Orthodox Church of Greece, a prolific writer of some fifty-five theological works and professor of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens. Dr. Bratsiotis's book was originally published in German under the title *Von der Griechischen Orthodoxie* by Echter-Verlag, Würzburg, 1966, and has now been made readily available in a palatable English translation by Dr. Joseph Blenkinsopp of the Divinity School of Vanderbilt University. Professor Bratsiotis's book is another concrete example of the result of ecumenical cooperation.

There are many fine books on the Orthodox Church now available in the major European languages. This one is unlike them in the sense that it is a kind of personal account of the Orthodox Church of Greece by one of her own theologians who is himself personally as well as professionally involved in the work of his church but is not a cleric. Brief as this book is, it is worth reading even though it contains no startlingly new views. It is written with these three guidelines in mind: (1) "Interconfessional dialogue will always break down where there is a lack of understanding of what makes Christians of other confessions the kind of Christians they are"; (2) love for the Orthodox Church and for the truth; (3) concern and love for all other churches. It soon becomes obvious that the spirit of this book is irenic but firmly and uncompromisingly faithful to the Greek Orthodox tradition and faith and yet clearly willing to learn from both Catholic and Protestant traditions. The American reader will be impressed by the heavily Germanic bibliography and will be surprised and disappointed by the lack of reference to the excellent work being done by American Orthodox scholars. The author of this book, in the words of the editor, Günter Stachel, in his Foreword, breathes ecumenism, "yet his ecumenism is based more on brotherly love than theological depth of thinking" (p. vi). The Preface by Cardinal Lorenz Jaeger, Archbishop of Paderborn (Germany), reiterates the importance of the decree on ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council and particularly the section entitled "The Special Position of the Eastern Churches" and calls attention to the fact that the East's "history is one of unbroken fidelity to the Gospel

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.



and the apostolic traditions, in the cause of which Eastern Christians have witnessed in spite of the severest trials and persecutions and even martyrdom" (p. vii).

Professor Bratsiotis's account, though ecumenical and personal, does not hesitate to point out the difficulties and obstacles that do meet and will meet any serious efforts at Orthodox-Catholic reconciliation and reunion. The short sections on the history of the Orthodox Church; the foundations of Orthodox belief; the Orthodox liturgy; the ethos, the monasticism, the constitution, and the attitude of the Orthodox Church to the world; the Orthodox Church and nationalism; the Orthodox Church and the State; basic principles and essential characteristics of Orthodoxy; the Orthodox Church and other Christian churches; the relation between Church and theology in Orthodoxy; religious movements in the Orthodox Church; the Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Movement and Roman Catholicism; and the "look into the future" are all more in the nature of thoughtful and pious reflections as seen by an Orthodox of Greek nationality rather than scholarly essays impeccably researched and complicatedly worked out.

All in all, in *The Greek Orthodox Church* Professor Bratsiotis has given us a book that will be a good review for adherents and students of the Orthodox faith and a substantial if personal primer for non-Orthodox readers.

JOHN E. REXINE  
*Colgate University*

DENO JOHN GEANAKOPOLOS, *Byzantine East and Latin West*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966. Pp. x and 206. \$1.95. Paperbound.

The present volume is an important contribution to medieval and renaissance studies. It includes six extremely valuable papers which Professor Geanakoplos has either read before academic societies or has published in scholarly periodicals. Each chapter is of engaging interest, lucid, scholarly, and of concern to historians and theologians alike.

In his illuminating prologue (pp. 1-10), which could have been better described as an introduction, the author wets the reader's appetite and prepares him for a delightful intellectual symposium. Even though the last two chapters of the book are the most original of all, this reviewer was greatly attracted by the first two.

Chapter One, "The Influences of Byzantine Culture on the Medieval Western World," is a well-structured discussion of Greek cultural influences upon Latin thought and civilization including philosophy, science, literature, medicine, industry, administration, religious piety, worship, and others. Geanakoplos confirms that there was a continuous intercourse between the Greek East and the Latin West from the fourth to at least the end of the fifteenth century. Cicero's observation concerning Greek influences upon the Roman West at his time, according to which "it was not a little rivulet that flowed from Greece into our city [Rome], but a mighty

river of culture and learning," may be repeated with some qualifications for the post-Constantinian era. The Latin West became impregnated with Greek cultural and intellectual elements.

It would be desirable, however, to know also to what degree Greek-Christian social thought and social institutionalized welfare activity influenced Western philanthropic philosophy and institutions. We know, for example, that Caesarius of Arles († c. 542) employed Greek terms and ideas in his sermons concerning public philanthropic establishments. Of course this is a topic in itself and can not be treated in a book devoted primarily to intellectual and theological problems.

The author convincingly argues that because of its activity and sway upon the West, Byzantine civilization must have been a positive and dynamic stream of tradition, thought, and life. This enjoyable chapter of 44 pages could be further developed and be published as a separate book — it is profoundly interesting.

The problem of Byzantine Caesaropapism, which is treated in the second chapter, is an old one. The author presents an analysis of the issue and defines the degree of actual Caesaropapism. He rightly stresses the view that in the Greek East there was no sharp dichotomy between the *βασιλεία* (*regnum*) and the *ιερωσύνη* (*sacerdotium*). The two were parallel authorities and constituted "a kind of symphonic duet," far from the Western concept of Caesaropapism — a term of modern Western origins. The author's appeal that "we should cease to apply the word Caesaropapism to Byzantine political theory" is based on substantial and convincing evidence.

Even though the author's bibliography was intended to be selective, I feel that Professor Peter Charanis' contribution on the significance of the Patriarch's role in the imperial coronation should have been consulted. Furthermore, it was Emperor Leo I, and not Anastasios (p. 72), who first received his crown and approval from the Patriarch.

In "The Council of Florence and the Problem of Union Between the Byzantine and Latin Churches" Professor Geanakoplos underlines that there were more than abstract theological misunderstandings which prevented a real union between the two worlds of Christendom. The Council of Florence was the climax as it were of some thirty different attempts at reunion between the middle eleventh and the fourteenth century. All failed because there were different and powerful forces at work — political, theological, psychological, linguistic, and others. Geanakoplos sees the traditional East-West antagonism and underlying tensions as the cause of each failure.

To be sure, the author analyzes here familiar events and issues; nevertheless he examines several aspects and incidents which have not been elucidated or stressed by Western historians: For example, the sentiment which prevailed in the Greek Church about the universal authority of an Ecumenical Synod against the authoritarian claims of the papacy, or the Greek fear that acceptance of union with the Latin Church meant Latinization not only of their religion but of their political, social, and economic life as well. The Greek distrust of the Latin motives found ground to be-

come even greater when a certain Latinization of the Greek Patriarchate was attempted upon the death there of the Patriarch Joseph. The Pope, Eugenius IV, proposed the enthronement of his nephew Francesco Condolmaro as the new Patriarch of Constantinople. Ecumenists will find this chapter very illuminating and helpful in their quest to understand the forces and bridge the chasm that divides Christendom.

In the second part of the book, Professor Geanakoplos examines Greco-Latin relations after the fall of Constantinople. "Byzantium and the Renaissance" includes three interrelated chapters which deal with direct or indirect Greek influences upon the West. They emanated either from the Greek colony in Venice or from the island of Crete. Maximos Margounios, a Cretan humanist-bishop, is studied as one of the more important bearers of Greek cultural tradition in the West. For the Western historian, the last two chapters of the present volume are of particular significance because they incorporate much original or hitherto unstudied material.

Professor Geanakoplos has provided us with a solid book which elucidates complex problems of a most perplexed era.

D. J. CONSTANTELOS  
*Hellenic College*

CHARLES M. BRAND, *Byzantium Confronts the West: 1180-1204*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Pp. x and 394.

Mr. Brand's detailed study accepts the challenge of one of the least attractive but most important periods in the history of the Byzantine empire: the years from the death of Manuel I Comnenus to the triumph of the Crusaders and the Venetians in 1204. In these 24 years all the sins of the empire seem to take on a concentrated nastiness. The roster of emperors displayed bloodstained neurotics like Andronicus I Comnenus, and specimens such as Alexius III Angelus, who overthrew his brother Isaac and had him blinded. The capital teemed with plotters and counter-plotters, venal officials and disloyal nobles, a sullen and murderous mob — all the standard paraphernalia of a romantic *grimoire* about the decadent Eastern Empire. More important, however, were the larger patterns of Byzantine failure: basic political instability, economic malfunction, the breakdown in acculturation and social communication which left the central government more and more isolated, the inability to establish decent and trustworthy provincial government in Europe and the Asian remnant — finally, the disfunction in foreign policy which was serious in the case of the Vlach-Bulgars and the Seljuq Sultanate, but fatal in respect to the new powers of the West. It is this last failure which Brand concentrates on, and with reason: no one can seriously say that Byzantium after the disaster of 1204 and the years of the Latin Empire kept more than a faint trace of its old potency.

Brand divides his study into two general sections: the political themes and developments from Andronicus' succession through Alexius III's reign, and the series of serious confrontations which built up to the Fourth Cru-

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

come even greater when a certain Latinization of the Greek Patriarchate was attempted upon the death there of the Patriarch Joseph. The Pope, Eugenius IV, proposed the enthronement of his nephew Francesco Condolmaro as the new Patriarch of Constantinople. Ecumenists will find this chapter very illuminating and helpful in their quest to understand the forces and bridge the chasm that divides Christendom.

In the second part of the book, Professor Geanakoplos examines Greco-Latin relations after the fall of Constantinople. "Byzantium and the Renaissance" includes three interrelated chapters which deal with direct or indirect Greek influences upon the West. They emanated either from the Greek colony in Venice or from the island of Crete. Maximos Margounios, a Cretan humanist-bishop, is studied as one of the more important bearers of Greek cultural tradition in the West. For the Western historian, the last two chapters of the present volume are of particular significance because they incorporate much original or hitherto unstudied material.

Professor Geanakoplos has provided us with a solid book which elucidates complex problems of a most perplexed era.

D. J. CONSTANTELOS  
*Hellenic College*

CHARLES M. BRAND, *Byzantium Confronts the West: 1180-1204*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Pp. x and 394.

Mr. Brand's detailed study accepts the challenge of one of the least attractive but most important periods in the history of the Byzantine empire: the years from the death of Manuel I Comnenus to the triumph of the Crusaders and the Venetians in 1204. In these 24 years all the sins of the empire seem to take on a concentrated nastiness. The roster of emperors displayed bloodstained neurotics like Andronicus I Comnenus, and specimens such as Alexius III Angelus, who overthrew his brother Isaac and had him blinded. The capital teemed with plotters and counter-plotters, venal officials and disloyal nobles, a sullen and murderous mob — all the standard paraphernalia of a romantic *grimoire* about the decadent Eastern Empire. More important, however, were the larger patterns of Byzantine failure: basic political instability, economic malfunction, the breakdown in acculturation and social communication which left the central government more and more isolated, the inability to establish decent and trustworthy provincial government in Europe and the Asian remnant — finally, the disfunction in foreign policy which was serious in the case of the Vlach-Bulgars and the Seljuq Sultanate, but fatal in respect to the new powers of the West. It is this last failure which Brand concentrates on, and with reason: no one can seriously say that Byzantium after the disaster of 1204 and the years of the Latin Empire kept more than a faint trace of its old potency.

Brand divides his study into two general sections: the political themes and developments from Andronicus' succession through Alexius III's reign, and the series of serious confrontations which built up to the Fourth Cru-

sade — the Norman invasion of 1185, Barbarossa's threat and the continued Hohenstauffen enmity, the tangled relations with the Italian trading cities of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, the various attempts to arrange matters with the papacy — all coming together in the events of 1203-4. This technique has a logical foundation — an unbroken narrative would surely hide the Western problem which is the book's focus behind the masses of data — and many successes. The character of Andronicus is properly left ambiguous. The wrestlings of Isaac Angelus with a host of difficulties is thoroughly presented, and as a result Isaac shows himself to be a very human figure: the middling man, not too bright but obstinately willing, over his head in a tangled job but making the best of it. Brand's emperors are all well done; he avoids the psychological probings and pseudo-typologies which bring their own traps, and musters the detail which implicitly describes the living, historical man, his wars and his triumphs.

Brand has in fact chosen to avoid the dramatic effect of large theories of historical connection or causation. His empire lurches into and out of peril, until at last it finds itself in a state of terminal crisis, from which neither rational policy nor luck could extricate it. The dense tone of the narrative is reinforced by Brand's close scrutiny of the primary sources, especially the courtier-rhetor-historian Nicetas Choniates: without borrowing the biases of this writer, Brand has caught the genuine feeling of his ornate perceptions. All this is to the good, in this modern age of over-theorizing. At the same time, some wider views might have been tried out without destroying the fabric of the study. The social dislocation in the empire is described but its roots remain mostly unexamined; this is also true of the crisis in leadership and responsibility in the civil and military aristocracies. The Fourth Crusade itself is pictured as a complicated but flat and two-dimensioned phenomenon: like all the crusades, the Fourth had a base in social pathology, in apocalyptic dreams which surfaced in violent destruction. On another level, a rigorous editing would have removed the slightly syncopated texture of the book: facts and relationships are repeated (or sometimes contradicted: see Frederick Barbarossa's attitude on p. 176 and p. 184, or Manuel's two Genoese policies on p. 207). The organization of the second part of the study is not as clear as it might be. In any event, Brand has researched deeply and written well, and his book should be an important secondary work in the working library of anyone trying to understand the disintegrating mosaic of Byzantine civilization in the general context of medieval history.

D. A. MILLER

*The University of Rochester*

*The Festal Menaion.* Translated from the original Greek by Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware. Introduction by Georges Florovsky. London: Faber and Faber, 1969. Pp. 564. 84 s.

The translators of the *Festal Menaion* have performed an extraordinary service to all English speaking Orthodox Christians with their presentation

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

By VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS

## INTRODUCTION

The city of Istanbul, surrounded by the waters of the Golden Horn, the Bosphorus, and the Sea of Marmara (Hellespont), has known a long history. Today, it is certain that in the time of the arrival of the Greek inhabitants from Megara under their legendary leader Byzas (658 B.C.) there existed an indigenous population of Thracian origin. From this year the city took the name of Byzantium, and its history as a Greek city constituted a part of the wider history of ancient Greece. The Romans followed. Constantine the Great, after his triumphal entrance into the city (324), chose Byzantium as the center of his Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire (to 1453). Henceforth, the new city would be known as Constantinople or the New Rome. From 1453 to 1923 the city of Istanbul was the capital of the Ottoman Empire, which replaced Byzantium. Within the modern Turkish Republic, with the capital having been moved to Ankara, Istanbul remains the first city after the capital.

The Christian community or Church in this city has been known by various names: as the Church and the bishopric of Byzantium; the Church, the bishopric, the archbishopric and the patriarchate of Constantinople or of New Rome; the Great Church of Christ, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and the Church of Phanar. In Turkish it is known as Istanbul or Fener Rum Patrikhanesi.

### I. THE BYZANTINE PERIOD (324-1453)

With the accession of Constantine the Great and the end of persecutions against Christians, a new era began in Church-State relations, which were in a particular way shaped in Byzantium. Church and State were here accepted as two parallel and inter-related hierarchies, each having at the top the patriarch and the emperor, both belonging to a single unity, serving the one Lord for the establishment of His Kingdom on earth and the well-being of their members.

The king, a layman himself, was the protector of the Church and had some priestly functions. This second special element of his office was apparent, e.g. in the ritual followed during his elec-



tion and coronation. The emperor was responsible for the unity of the Church, and for maintaining the purity of the Orthodox faith by calling the Ecumenical Councils and giving to their decisions the status of state laws. He took an active role in the domain of Church legislation, either by making the Church canons state laws or by issuing laws affecting the life of the Church. In Church organization he had special rights during and after the election of the Ecumenical Patriarchs. He was actively engaged in the establishment of new dioceses and monasteries, and he also dealt with matters related to the clergy. During holy worship he could enter the altar, stay and receive the holy communion like a priest, offer the incense, and bless the faithful with the trikerion.

The principle of only dealing with the external affairs of the Church was not always kept by the Byzantine emperors, who on some occasions would directly interfere with the affairs of the Church and force the Church on points of doctrine and unity and on matters affecting the election and resignation of patriarchs and other hierarchs. On such occasions of open clash between State and Church in Byzantium we see the Church almost always winning the victory in the long run.

This ideal of Church-State relations was transplanted to those nations and states which received the Christian faith through the missionary efforts of the Byzantines, such as Bulgaria, Serbia, Russia, and Rumania.

Authors like Harnack, Vailhe, Janin, and Dvornik definitely accept the existence of the Christian Church in Byzantium during the second century, A.D. From written sources it is not possible to ascertain the year in which Christianity was preached in this city. Connected with this is the tradition of Andrew, the brother of Peter, who came to Byzantium and established the first ecclesiastical organization during his itinerary to Scythia. Two present-day scholars have written on this subject: Fr. Dvornik thinks possible the existence of the above tradition from the time of Constantine the Great but rejects its historicity; Gennadios of Heliopolis seems to accept this tradition as possessing historical value which could be traced, according to him, to the time before Constantine. This tradition cannot be easily overlooked by historians.

The Church of Byzantium appears in history first as a bishopric of the diocese of Heracleia, Thrace, even in the time of and after the foundation of New Rome (330). It grew to a great

ecclesiastical center through the years 330-451, because of its special position as the capital of the empire. Here the principle of adaptation to the political division and administrative organization of the empire was applied, while later the other principle of apostolic origin was also taken into consideration. Canon 3 of the II Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381) conferred upon the bishop of this city, for being the New Rome, the second rank after the bishop of Rome. Thus the line of precedence of the first bishops became: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch. Canon 28 of the IV Ecumenical Council in Chalcedon (451) gave definite shape to the organization of the Church of Constantinople. Accordingly, the Church of Constantinople kept the same rank, acknowledged to her by the Second Ecumenical Council, and took ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the former autonomous dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace (Caesarea, Ephesus, Heracleia) and the metropolitans of the sees in the lands of the barbarians. After the Great Schism between East and West (1054) the first place in the precedence within the Orthodox Church, that is, a primacy of honor, was accorded to the Ecumenical Patriarch.

The head of the Church of Byzantium and Constantinople was called in the beginning bishop and archbishop. Later, in the years of Acacius (471-489), he received the title of patriarch. Since John II (518-520), he has been known as Ecumenical Patriarch. From the thirteenth century on, his full title has been "by the grace of God Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch." The election of the bishop of Constantinople was at first done by a body composed of clergy and laymen, but later by a synod of bishops, which had the duty to prepare a list of three names, among whom the final choice was entrusted to the emperor. The general rule was to choose a patriarch out of the clergy and the monks. There have been a few occasions, though, when patriarchs were elected from laymen and bishops or patriarchs of other sees in the East. The patriarchal residence was in the same area as the cathedral churches of St. Irene, Saints Apostles, and the Holy Wisdom. With the establishment of the Latin Empire (1204-1261), the patriarchal residence was moved to Nicaea.

In order to deal with different matters concerning the life of the Church, the bishop of Constantinople summoned synods, mainly composed of bishops. The first synod known to us is of the year 335/336 against Marcellus of Ancyra. In the beginning

the regular yearly diocesan and patriarchal synods were quite customary. A feature of the synodical regime here was the *endemousa*, a synod called by the patriarch and composed of bishops and metropolitans being present in the city or having dioceses in the vicinity. A third specimen was the extraordinary patriarchal synod, in which all or most metropolitans of the patriarchate participated. The diocesan synods stopped functioning in the twelfth, while the yearly patriarchal synods ceased in the thirteenth century. The most common synod in the patriarchate became the *endemousa*, which, since that period, met on a more regular and permanent basis. Mainly, the *endemousa* and the extraordinary synods continued to operate until and after the fall of the city (1453).

The so-called officials or *archontes* of the patriarchate carried out the everyday routine work, thus forming a permanent body around the patriarch; it was occasionally able to exert a strong influence upon him.

After the patriarch ranked the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, all belonging to the third order of the higher clergy. The metropolitan, being the bishop of a big city in a large area, had some pre-eminence over the bishops in the same district. The autocephalous archbishops, without having any bishops under them, were directly responsible to the Ecumenical Patriarch. The bishops were diocesan, but in the first centuries we also come across suffragant bishops as well.

The jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate extended over a vast geographic area. In the fifth century the whole of Asia Minor, Thrace, and the dioceses around the Black Sea were under the patriarch. The growth in the number of bishops was due to the geographic extension of the empire and the missionary work undertaken by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. From the fourth to the ninth centuries the total number of metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops was between 500-600. In the eighth century Eastern Illyricum, that is, the lands of the southern Balkans with the Greek islands, the island of Sicily, and parts of Italy were annexed to the patriarchate. With the spreading of Christianity from Byzantium among the Slavs — Bohemians, Moravians, Serbs, Bulgarians, and Russians — the patriarchate established many more dioceses. The Church of Bulgaria was at times independent or under the patriarchate. The Church of Serbia also won her independence. The Church of Russia stayed until the end of this

period under the patriarchate. During the years of the Latin Empire of Constantinople and after the coming of the Seljuk and the Ottoman Turks, the number of bishoprics constantly diminished. In the fourteenth century we also have the two metropoleis of present-day Rumania, that is, of Wallachia, and Moldavia. In the fifteenth century the total number of bishops of all categories was 150, a number which has, more or less, remained the same to the present.

The Church of Byzantium was always a missionary Church. Like Rome in the West, Constantinople in the East was a great center for propagating Christianity among the different nations. A special strategy and a particular method of work were applied in the missionary field in the East. The conversion of those in command in the barbarian states was sought; personnel well-trained for this kind of work was used; the Bible, the liturgical and other ecclesiastical books were translated into the local language; the liturgy was sung and preaching done in the vernacular; and a hierarchy was regularly established. Beginning with the fourth century, this work was undertaken among the Goths, the Armenians, in India, Iberia, Lazia, among the other Asiatic nations, the different Slavic nations, and the Wallachs. With the fall of the Byzantine Empire the missionary efforts of the Ecumenical Patriarchate came to a stop.

The see of Constantinople has played a great role in the work of defining and explaining the dogmas on the one hand, and of promulgating the canons of the Church on the other. Great heresies, schisms, and theological discussions affecting dogma, order, and the unity of the Church are connected with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. All seven Ecumenical Councils of the one undivided Church, which constitute the highest authority in Orthodoxy, were called either in Constantinople or in an area within its ecclesiastical domain. The First Council of Nicaea (325) condemned Arius and promulgated the doctrine of the "homoousion." The Second of Constantinople (381) gave a final solution to the sequels of Arianism, condemning the Pneumatomachians. Our symbol of faith, connected with the two Councils, is known as symbol of Nicaea-Constantinople. The Third of Ephesus (431) condemned Nestorius and approved the use of the name of Theotokos for Mary. The Fourth of Chalcedon (451) dealt with the dogma of the two natures of Christ and condemned Monophysitism. Since the fifth century there have existed the Ancient East-

ern Churches of Nestorian and Monophysite origin: Assyrian, Syrian, or Jacobite with their daughter Church in South India, Coptic, Ethiopian, and Armenian. The Fifth of Constantinople (553) condemned the Three Chapters and Origenism. The Sixth of Constantinople (680-1) condemned Monothelitism, a logical sequency of Monophysitism; the Seventh of Nicaea (787) dealt with the teaching on the veneration of icons.

Relations of the see of Constantinople with the other Churches have seen some occasional rifts. In the fourth and the fifth centuries there was some tension between Constantinople and Alexandria. From the time of the Arabic conquest of the East the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were mostly elected, and lived in, Constantinople. The Ecumenical Patriarchate displayed to these sister Churches a brotherly interest, helping them to maintain their existence. Ecclesiastical communion between the Churches of the two Romes had several times been cut in the years before the ninth century. These two great ecclesiastical centers were the symbols of the two parts within the one Christian Church and world. Unfortunately, several negative factors were operating against the unity of the Church, such as the division of the empire, the continuation of the same empire in the East, and the cataclysmic events in the West, the coming of the new races, the foundation of the Frankish and the Germanic Empires, and the differences in language and on the ways of life and thought. Aside from those, there were in sight two different tendencies within the Church, i.e., in the reaching out of the Church to those outside, the theological speculation and language, Church customs, worship, Church organization, and the dogmas. Two of the greatest differences were: the one affecting Church order, that is, the claim of the pope for a *de jure* primacy over the whole world in opposition to the theory of the pentarchy of the patriarchal sees with primacy of honor accorded to the pope in the East; and second, the difference over the *Filioque*. But most important of all was the freezing of the spirit of Christian love. The first actualization of the Great Schism between the two Churches occurred in the ninth century with the pope Nicholas I and the patriarch Photius I. 1054 is accepted as the year in which the Great Schism between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople happened, but the chasm of the Churches became a reality during the period of the Crusades. In the same period Westerners established the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, and other

patriarchates in the East with Latin hierarchs, thus forming the first Uniate Churches in the East. From the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries several efforts were made to reunite the two Churches, but none of them bore any real fruits, because of the views of the popes, and their animation in the East only from the Byzantine emperors.

Other movements of the same kind were those of the Paulicians and the Bogomils in the Balkans and of Palamism or Hesychasm, the last of which can be also understood within the wider context of relations between East and West.

Monasticism is accepted as one of the considerable spiritual forces in the Eastern Church. Begun in Egypt, it moved to Palestine and Syria and then covered the whole ecclesiastical area of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, that is, Asia Minor, Constantinople, Greece, the islands, Sicily, South Italy, the Balkans, and Russia. Within this area both styles of monastic life, the eremitic and cenobitic, were to be found, but most usual was the second. From the fourteenth century the idiorrhythmic life appears also on the scene. The first monastery in Byzantium was that of Dalmatios (382); other famous ones were of the Akoimetoï (420) and of Studios (463). Janin counts 325 monasteries, for men and women, which existed in the capital and its European suburbs during the Byzantine Empire. Other famous monastic centers were: St. Basil's in Cappadocia; Mt. St. Auxentios and Mt. Olympos in Bithynia; Mt. Latros near Miletos; in Thessalonike; Athos and Meteora in Greece; and in Patmos. Monasteries belonged to different categories: imperial, patriarchal or stauropeghia, diocesan or independent, known as such according to their founders. St. Basil's rule was used for their government. St. Theodore the Studite adopted this to the needs of his times, and his rule was put into practice in Mount Athos. Monks spent their time in contemplation, prayer, and manual work. Monasteries were centers of ecclesiastical and Greek education, copying manuscripts, hymnography, painting, piety and mysticism, the defense of Orthodoxy, and philanthropy. In the strife of the two ecclesiastical parties, that is, the liberals and the traditionalists, the monastic world stood almost always for the latter.

The fourth to sixth centuries constitute the golden period in the worship of the Eastern Church, with Constantinople as a center. This Church did not have at the beginning its own liturgical tradition, but acquired the components of it from other Christian

areas, such as Asia Minor, Antioch, and possibly Jerusalem, giving to them an enrichment, organic unity, and a final shape. The liturgies connected with SS. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom are the best examples of the Byzantine liturgical genius. These, little by little, replaced all other Eastern liturgies (twelfth century). Liturgical life had almost been completed in the eighth century although the Iconoclastic controversy (the eighth and ninth centuries) worked as a setback to it. With the Macedonian dynasty (ninth century) things regained their old setting. The Church calendar in the East in general and in Constantinople in particular contained feasts for Christ and the Holy Trinity, Theotokos, and the Saints. In the last category were included martyrs, confessors, monks, patriarchs, bishops and other clerics, emperors and members of the royal family, and laymen. There were also days for the commemoration of events connected with the Holy Cross, Churches and monasteries, political life, and natural phenomena. Byzantine liturgical life was enriched by the Byzantine hymnographers, most of them living or holding offices in Constantinople, Romanus the Melodus being the greatest of all (sixth century). Their hymns were sung with a special music called Byzantine. Preaching formed an integral part of the liturgical life. One can furnish a long list of well-known preachers, with St. John Chrysostom at the top, and of sermons during the whole period of Byzantine history. Byzantine architecture and painting were at the service of holy worship. Byzantine architecture, with the great example of the Church of Holy Wisdom in Constantinople, a combination of the ancient basilica square with a dome, was formed from the Syriac and the Hellenistic styles, imbued with the Christian spirit. The same can be said for painting, which includes panel-icons, wall-paintings (frescoes), mosaics, and illuminated manuscripts. Byzantine art tried to make heaven a reality in the eyes of worshipers and to bring them into the mystery and symbolism of the great act of the offering of the whole creation of God.

The Church of Byzantium administered the different phases of organized philanthropy. Institutions of that kind, being attached to the monasteries, were established by the emperors, members of the royal family, and others. There were houses for the old, guest houses including hospitals, hospices, orphanages, creches, and asylums for the poor.

Within the Byzantine Empire there were several centers of

ecclesiastical and theological learning, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Cappadocia. For several external reasons, these centers started to deteriorate. Their academic traditions moved slowly but steadily to Constantinople, which kept its importance in the domain of letters to the end. Theology, in connection with that Church, can be studied in two distinctive periods: the first, which is generally known as the patristic (fourth to eighth centuries), and the second, the Byzantine (ninth to fifteenth centuries). Characteristics of the first period are the tendency to make a synthesis between the Greek spirit and Christianity, to define and explain Christian faith, and an originality in all fields of theology; characteristics of the second are a spirit of traditionalism, with an air of originality in relation to persons and sectors not studied in the first period, that is, ascetic theology, symbolism, mysticism, polemics, and the like. The whole of Byzantine society was imbued with the air and living in the atmosphere of the Church. Also, theology was not a pastime of a few persons only; patriarchs, hierarchs, clergy, and monks on the one hand, and emperors and men from the different strata of society on the other, were studying theology.

In Byzantium, besides the regular grammar and secular schools and the university, there were also special institutions for ecclesiastical and theological education. There were the patriarchal school of theology, schools in each diocese, and the monastic schools. There was a continuing discussion on the autonomy of the patriarchal school from the university in Constantinople. Present scholarship stands for the autonomy of this school, although lines of dependence between the two higher institutions in Byzantium were apparent.

The existence of libraries in these institutions is an important factor for the on-going study of theology. The work of copying manuscripts and decorating them was done in the scriptoria.

## II. THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE (1453-1923) — THE TURKISH REPUBLIC (1923-1964)

Immediately after the conquest of the city by the Ottoman Turks (1453), the Ecumenical Patriarchate faced new relations with a new state, of which the official religion was Islam. According to some information, Mohammed II the conqueror normalized those relations within his empire, by taking into consideration



the teaching of the Koran on this matter and the interests of his empire. He accepted the Greek Orthodox as a separate and autonomous religious and ethnic entity (the Greek nation, Rum milleti), and the patriarch as their spiritual and ethnic leader (ethnarch, Millet basi). In this way, the patriarch assumed rights pertaining only to the spiritual domain of the Church, as was the case with the Byzantines, but also those affecting family, social customs, and education of the members of the Church. The Conqueror gave written orders, the so-called berat (ordinance) to the first patriarch after the conquest, Gennadios Scholarios, in which these special rights were officially acknowledged. The berat was given to the patriarchs and the metropolitans. Patriarch Germanos V (1913-18) was the last to receive such a berat. The sultan, although a non-Christian, acted in some ways like the Byzantine emperors. For example, he, after the election of each patriarch, would personally install the patriarch (patriarchs appeared before the grand vizirs instead of the emperors in the years (1657-1834).

All non-Muslims had to pay the so-called head tax. Each patriarch, beginning with the year 1467, started to pay at his election a special tax called peskes and yearly the so-called haradj (after 1474). After the eighteenth century no mention of these taxes is made.

Janissaries were recruited from the male Christian children, who were taken from their families and islamized, with the last probable mention of this custom in 1637. Islam had been accepted by Christians, as individuals or groups, mainly in some Balkan states, like Albania, Serbia, and Bosnia. Several Byzantine Churches had been turned into mosques, which still exist in Istanbul, like the Churches of Holy Wisdom (Aya Sofya muzesi), SS. Apostles (Fatih camii), Pammakaristos (Fethiye camii), the monastery of Chora (Kariye muzesi).

With the Ottoman Empire there existed a religious freedom and a policy of toleration for Christians and Jews. The religious policy within the Ottoman Empire, a non-Christian state, could be better understood by comparison with the position accorded to the heretics, schismatics, Jews, and Muslims during the same period within the Christian West. Of course, the application of the special rights acknowledged to Christians in the Ottoman Empire depended on the personal will of the sultan and the governors and certain events.

With the treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji (1774) Russia, an Orthodox state, took over the right to interfere in the empire for the Orthodox citizens, as France was doing for Roman Catholics.

Special mention should be made here of the so-called Phanariots, connected with the quarter of Phanar, who started as merchants, lawyers, and interpreters. They eventually entered the Ottoman state service. The highest position held by them was of the Grand Dragoman of the Porte, which in reality meant under-secretary for foreign affairs. The first such Interpreter was Panagiotakis Nikousios, whose successor was Alexander Mavrokordatos, the chief delegate of the Ottomans in the treaty of Karlowitz (1699). The Phanariots assumed the position of the Dragoman of the fleet and Hospodars in the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. Their service falls within the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Attempts to reform the Ottoman Empire according to Western ideals started in the eighteenth century, and also affected religion. With several state decisions a policy was enacted to equalize before the law the non-Muslim and the Muslim Ottomans. The Hatti-Sherif of Gulhane (1839) and mainly the Hatti-Hymayun (1856) were such examples. This policy continued during the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century (until 1923). Of course, this in reality meant the abolition of the special rights acknowledged to the Orthodox Church by the conqueror.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate had at the same time members living in Roman Catholic and Orthodox states. In the latter the Byzantine ideal of Church-State relations was in practice, while in the Roman Catholic states, such as Venice, Austria, Hungary, and Poland, Orthodox had to face from time to time difficulties in becoming Uniats and in being absorbed into the Roman Church.

After the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) the Ecumenical Patriarchate continued to function as a religious and spiritual institution only. External rights recognized by the Ottoman Turks ceased to exist. After the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece, the Greek Orthodox remained only in Istanbul and the islands of Imroz and Bozcaada (Tenedos), with some special rights to run their religious, educational, and philanthropic institutions, analogous to the Turks of Western Thrace in Greece.

In the modern Turkish Republic (1923) the Ecumenical Patri-

archate has the status of a free Church within a secular state, the Moslem members of which are in the absolute majority. Its dioceses in the continent of Europe, Asia, Australia, and the Americas have the status of mostly free churches within secular states, in which, with some exemptions, almost all their members are in the majority Christians, or have the same status in countries of which state religions are Roman Catholicism, Anglicanism, or Lutheranism, and the status of a State Church, as in Greece and Finland.

One of the prerogatives of the honorary pre-eminence of the Ecumenical Patriarch within Orthodoxy is his right to take initiatives, deal directly, and occasionally represent Orthodoxy in her relations with the heterodox. The activities of the patriarchate in this domain are very rich.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate maintains good relations with the Ancient Eastern Churches. The establishment of the Armenian Patriarchate in Istanbul (1461) by Mohammed II normalized relations between the two Churches. In 1756 the Ecumenical Patriarchate decided to rebaptize the Armenians who entered the Orthodox Church. This was the practice to the end of the nineteenth century, after which the ancient custom of accepting them by chrism was once again in use. In the twentieth century a great rapprochement is in sight between these two Churches, by the exchange of visits of the two patriarchs and other persons, the exchange of Churches, and other hopeful signs. The Catholicos of Etchmiadzin Vasken I paid a visit to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the year 1961 and the metropolitan of Miletus Emilianos teaches at the Armenian Theological School in Uskudar, Istanbul.

There is an exchange of correspondence between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Syrian Church in Malabar. Several members of this Church have been to Phanar. In 1956 the then bishop (now archbishop of North and South America) Iakovos visited this Church on behalf of the patriarchate and, in 1961, after the New Delhi Assembly, the delegates of the Patriarchate were official guests of the Church of Malabar in South India.

Patriarch Athenagoras, during his visit to the Middle East in 1959, had personal contacts with the Syrian Jacobite Patriarch in Damascus, who in 1963 visited the Patriarchate in Phanar. Athenagoras, during the same trip, visited the Patriarch of the Copts in Egypt. In 1956 after Malabar, the bishop of Melita paid

in the same capacity a visit to the Church of Ethiopia. In the last few years, the Theological School of Halki accepted students from this Church.

A token of the growing friendship between the patriarchate and the Ancient Eastern Churches was the inclusion of the topic of relations between Orthodoxy and these Churches in the agenda of the Pan-Orthodox conferences of Mt. Athos (1930) and Rhodes (1961), the promulgation from the Patriarchate of the encyclical of 1951 on the 1500th anniversary of the Fourth Ecumenical Council in Chalcedon (451), and the presence of representatives from these Churches in the Pan-Orthodox conference in Rhodes (1961) and the festivities on the millennium of Mt. Athos (1963-1963). The time seems to be ripe for the beginning of well-prepared and continuous conversations between Orthodoxy and these Churches with a view to their future reunion.

The two parties in the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the one for and the other against the union with Rome, existing during the end of the Byzantine period, were still functioning, at least until the seventeenth century. Consequently, Roman Catholic influences on Orthodox theology started to be felt. The main aim of Rome was to bring the patriarchate, and all Orthodox, back to Rome through preaching, sacramental life, education, philanthropy, and interference in politics. To this end mainly the Jesuit Order, the Greek College of St. Athanasius (1581), the Congregation of Propaganda (1622), with a special branch for the Orientals (1917), and the Uniate Church scheme were in use. In most of the Latin states Orthodox hierarchy was replaced by a Latin or a Uniate one and members of the Church were forced to become Uniats or Latins. The Ottoman state had on several occasions issued firmans, condemning the work of proselytizing its Orthodox citizens to the Roman faith. The synod of 1756 in Istanbul decided to accept Roman Catholics into the Orthodox faith by rebaptizing them, a custom continued to the beginning of the twentieth century. The Ecumenical Patriarchate was on the alert to meet the efforts of the Latins within its own ecclesiastical jurisdiction and to help the other Orthodox Churches as well. During the nineteenth century and at the present time we see the exchange of encyclicals between the Church leaders of the two Romes.

Pope Pius IX invited the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the I Vatican Ecumenical Council (1870) but Gregory VI rejected

this invitation. The patriarchate did not send observers to the first two sessions (1962-3) of the Second Vatican Council (1962-) after conferring with the other Orthodox Churches. The subject of the relations of the two Churches was included in the agendas of the two Pan-Orthodox conferences (1930, 1961). In the Pan-Orthodox conference of Rhodes (1963) it was decided to start with Rome a "dialogue on equal terms," with the understanding that the Ecumenical Patriarch take the initiative on the Orthodox side. The Pan-Orthodox conference of Rhodes, originally scheduled for 1964, will decide how to proceed on this affair. Officials of the Roman Catholic monastic world were present in Mt. Athos (1963).

The climate between the two Churches started to improve with the exchange of positive messages between the late Pope John XXIII (Christmas 1958) and the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras (New Year 1959). The greatly discussed meeting of Roman Catholics with Orthodox at Rhodes (1959), although unofficial in character, should be accepted as a positive step in the relations of these two Churches. With the election of the new pope Paul VI (1963) a regular correspondence started between the two prelates and friendship is improving. These common efforts found their culmination in the historic meeting of pope Paul and patriarch Athenagoras in Jerusalem in the first week of 1964. In the academic field, theologians of the two Churches cooperate in theological and other conferences, and in some common editions. Students from the Ecumenical Patriarchate go for graduate studies to Roman Catholic Theological Schools. For the first time in history (1964) a Greek couple were married by an Orthodox priest in an Orthodox marriage ceremony in the Roman Catholic Church of St. Agnes, Phoenix, Arizona, U.S.A.

Old Catholics, immediately after their break with Rome (1870), started friendly and official ecclesiastical contacts with the Orthodox Church, including the Ecumenical Patriarchate, aiming to unite with them. The two Union Conferences at Bonn (1874, 1875) showed the lines of approach between these two Churches. The Ecumenical Patriarchate sent delegates to the Second Conference. This common cause was kept alive through official pronouncements, correspondence, visits, theological conferences, offering of scholarships, and special writings. The existing relations were favorably commented upon in the Orthodox correspondence of Joacheim III (1902-4) and the Pan-Orthodox

conferences of Mt. Athos (1930) and Rhodes (1961). Delegates of the two Churches, including the Ecumenical Patriarchate, met and discussed several common points in Geneva (1920), Lausanne (1927), and Bonn (1931), accomplishing a substantial degree of agreement. This was mainly done in the meeting of the Joint Commission of Orthodox and old Catholics at Bonn (1931), called by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and chaired from the Orthodox side by Germanos of Thyateira, who was also the inspirer of the previous two meetings. During the visit of an Old Catholic delegation to Phanar, presided over by the Archbishop of Utrecht Andreas Rinkel (1962), it was decided to form again the Joint Commission of Orthodox and Old Catholics for the continuation of theological conversations. Old Catholics were present at the Pan-Orthodox conference of Rhodes (1961) and the festivities of Mt. Athos (1963).

Contacts between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Church of England began after the Reformation. With the passage of time they have taken various forms and developed for the better.

In the seventeenth century a correspondence began between the Archbishops of Canterbury and the Ecumenical Patriarch. The Anglican chaplains in the British diplomatic and commercial delegations and the visitors from England helped the West to understand the East. The relations of the Nonjurors with the Eastern Churches constitute the most important event in the eighteenth century. In the second half of the nineteenth century relations of the Anglican Communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate were resumed after an interval of a century and a half owing to proselytism. This was mainly due to the Oxford Movement, the conferences at Bonn and Lambeth, the establishment of Anglican communities within the Orthodox ecclesiastical territory and the opposite, the foundation within the Anglican Communion of associations on the Eastern Churches, the exchange of visits, and the beginning of official correspondence (1899).

Contacts during the twentieth century show a substantial degree of improvement, together with some stagnation, for external reasons. The two first sees of Constantinople and Canterbury take most of the initiative in prompting those relations.

In the beginning (1901-1914), contacts were academic and theoretical in character with a degree of ignorance existing on both sides. Anglicans fervently wished the realization of inter-

communion. Androutsos, then professor at Halki, wrote in 1903 his classical study on the validity of Anglican Ordinations. In the inter-Orthodox correspondence of Joachim III favorable comments were made upon the Anglican communion. In 1907, the same Patriarch appointed as his apokrisiarios to the see of Canterbury an archimandrite, the Metropolitan of Thyateira acting in this capacity since 1922, and the first Anglican student entered the School of Halki.

World War I (1914-18) opened a new era in this field (to 1930), with the assistance rendered by Anglicans to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the existence of strong personalities, the ecclesiastical character of contacts and mutual interest. From the Ecumenical Patriarchate the names of Patriarch Meletios IV (1921-23) and Germanos of Thyateira (1922-1951) deserve mention. The Ecumenical Patriarchate sent, for the first time in history, to the Sixth Lambeth Conference (1920) an official delegation, which had theological conversations. In 1922 the Ecumenical Patriarchate decided in favor of recognition of the validity of Anglican Ordinations, and in 1925 was represented in the commemoration of the 1600th anniversary of the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea, held in London (325/1925).

The final phase of these relations, begun in 1930, bore marks of the two Orthodox-Anglican theological conversations in Lambeth of 1930 and 1931, of which the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury were the conveners and organizers. The degree of agreement reached there was admirable. In the Pan-Orthodox conferences of Mt. Athos (1930) and Rhodes (1961) the relations of the two Churches were stated in a positive way. Delegates of the Ecumenical Patriarchate were present in the last two Lambeth Conferences of 1948 and 1958. Of great importance were the visits to Phanar of the two Archbishops of Canterbury, G. Fisher (1960) and M. Ramsey (1962). During those visits and the ensuing official correspondence between the two sees an agreement has been reached to reappoint a Joint Doctrinal Commission between the two Churches. Anglican and Episcopal delegates were present in Rhodes (1961) and Mt. Athos (1963).

Protestantism being a movement which sprang from Roman Catholicism, was not of immediate interest for Orthodoxy and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Protestants in their fight against Rome tried to win the Ecumenical Patriarchate to their side. In

order to make their plans real they used the diplomatic delegations in the East, the chaplains serving therein, philanthropy, correspondence, publications, and contacts, both personal and ecclesiastical. In facing those contacts the Patriarchate kept a position of reserve, accepted and cultivated friendly relations with Protestants, explaining at the same time Orthodox teachings in comparison with Protestant thought and condemning Protestant heterodoxies.

The first official contact of the Patriarchate with Lutheranism took place between Melanchthon and the deacon Demetrius Mysos, who on behalf of Patriarch Joasaph II came to Wittenberg in 1559 in order to acquire a first-hand knowledge of the faith and customs of Protestants. Mysos, who seems to have fallen under the influence of Lutheranism, brought back upon his return the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession and a letter of Melanchthon to Joasaph. The Patriarch, as it seems, did not send an answer to Melanchthon.

The second instance was the correspondence of the Patriarch Jeremias II with the theologians at Tübingen (1573-1581), in which the most important Christian doctrines were discussed. For the first time in history Orthodox and Protestants were meeting each other on an official theological level, and this stands as a starting point for all forthcoming confrontations of the two denominations.

One of the tragic figures in this field is the Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris (1572-1638), who could be better understood within the wider context of the struggle for preponderance between Roman Catholic and Protestant powers in the East. In the seventeenth century the two ecclesiastical parties within the Ecumenical Patriarchate took the form of pro-Roman and pro-Protestant parties. Loukaris thought the salvation of his Church would depend on the Protestant world and so he became the leader of the pro-Protestant party. In facing the Orthodox he acted like one of them, while in his dealings with Protestants he was lenient with them. His Protestant Confession seems to have been written by him as a personal document in order to please the Protestants. Protestant influence on other Orthodox theologians can be found in the same period. Several synods held in the seventeenth century in Istanbul dealt with Protestantism.

Beginning with the eighteenth century, those relations were unfortunately obscured, because of the missionary work under-



taken by several Protestant bodies within the Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Patriarchs like Gregory VI and Joacheim III tried their best to confront these disruptive Protestant tendencies. The conferences of Mt. Athos (1930) and Rhodes (1961) include this subject in Orthodox agendas. From the beginning of the twentieth century a new atmosphere, which is due to the appearance of the Ecumenical Movement, of friendship, understanding, and cooperation, at least on the practical level, has been formed, and thus have the Protestants in a sense accepted the Orthodox East.

The role of the Patriarchate in the Ecumenical Movement has been considerable, seen from different aspects. Particularly, though, one may stress two points, that the Patriarchate was one of the few Christian Churches which proposed and worked for the formation of the movement, and that it was and still is one of the most faithful members and ardent supporters of the Ecumenical Movement.

In the encyclical letters of 1902-4 relations between Orthodox and other Christian Confessions were touched upon and favorably commented upon. In the Second Encyclical of 1920, "unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be," the formation of a league or a council of Churches was proposed, and a scheme containing the appropriate practical steps to be taken was given. From the Preliminary Conference on Faith and Order in Geneva (1920) the Patriarchate and other Orthodox Churches started to participate in this movement. Its delegates were present in the World Conferences on Life and Work (I, Stockholm, 1925; II, Oxford, 1937) and on Faith and Order (I, Lausanne, 1927; II, Edinburgh, 1937; III, Lund, 1952; IV, Montreal, 1963). All Orthodox delegates, present in those conferences, formed one body under the leadership of the far-sighted ecumenist Germanos of Thyateira (died 1951). Besides the regular delegates from the Patriarchate, mention should be made of the work accomplished in this field by the theologians of the Russian Exarchate in Paris, under the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Matters connected with this movement were studied by the synodical committee on the Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Christian Conferences and later by that on the Pan-Christian Question. At this point, the periodicals published in the Patriarchate should not be forgotten.

The same can be said on the participation of the Patriarchate in the World Council of Churches. Its delegates took an active

part in all the deliberations of the Council from the beginning (1938). The Encyclical of 1952 deals with the relations of Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement. The Patriarchate sent delegates to the General Assemblies (I, Amsterdam, 1948; II, Evanston, 1954; III, New Delhi, 1961). Orthodox Presidents of the Council have been in order (1) Germanos of Thyateira (till 1951); (2) Athenagoras of Thyateira (Kavadas, 1951-4); (3) Michael of North and South America (1954-8); (4) Iakovos of North and South America (1959-). In relation to the Orthodox Churches, the Patriarchate tried to persuade them to join the World Council of Churches, a thing which today is a happy reality. The Patriarchate established a Permanent Liaison Office at the Headquarters in Geneva (1955), first organized and directed by the Bishop of Melita, Iakovos (1955-9). Its second director is Metropolitan Emilianos of Calabria (1959-). The meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in Rhodes (1959) stands as the first ecumenical event to take place within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate, in which the fullest Orthodox participation in the history of the Council was recorded. The relations of Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement appear in the Orthodox agenda at Rhodes (1961), where, and at Mt. Athos (1963), the Council was also invited to attend.

In the present stage, which the World Council of Churches and the relations of Orthodox to it have reached, it seems appropriate for the Patriarchate to make an over-all study of this problem and prepare a new encyclical.

External conditions within which the Patriarchate lived, and the formulation of dogmas in the past, did not form suitable ground for the birth of great heresies and theological discussions in the old sense. Nevertheless, we come across some heretical tendencies, theological and ecclesiastical discussions, and schisms which were due to the influences coming from the West, the existence of some heretical or schismatic tendencies from the past, the lower level of education, and the awakening of nationalistic spirit. Joannikios Kartanos (sixteenth century) in his book called *Anthos* expounded some pantheistic and anti-trinitarian teachings. The monk Matthew from Melenikon (sixteenth century) denied that Christ died on the Cross. Theophilos Korydalleus (1563-1645), one of the great teachers of his time who belonged to the circle of Loukaris, was accused of holding Calvinistic opinions. The same can be said of John Karyophyllis, who in addition

fought the use of the term "metousiosis." Methodios Anthrakites (eighteenth century), a teacher, was accused of being a pantheist and extreme mystic. Christodoulos Acarnan (eighteenth century), following pantheism and the teachings of French Encyclopedists, was denying the basic Christian doctrines. After the heated discussions and events which had taken place in the diocese of Izmit (Nicomedia) and Istanbul under the leadership of a monk called Auxentios (on the rebaptizing of the Latins and Armenians), a decision for this, as it is stated before, was taken by the synod at Istanbul in 1756. In Mt. Athos, on the other hand, we come across some disputes, touching matters of worship, such as on the mnemosyna (liturgies for the commemoration of the dead) and frequent communion (eighteenth century), over the sacredness of the name of Jesus Christ and the old calendar (twentieth century). The Ecumenical Patriarchate duly dealt with the above-mentioned disputes, taking the appropriate measures. The teachings of Theophilos Kaires (1784-1853), who was a member of the Church of Greece, were of interest to the Patriarchate, which had to deal with his students.

The Church of Bulgaria remained in a state of schism from the Patriarchate and some Orthodox Churches from 1872 to 1945. This was due to the appearance among the Orthodox of the spirit of ethnophyletism (naturalism) and the tendencies of the Bulgarians to create not an autocephalous Bulgarian Church inside the bounds of their state only, but to include in it all Bulgarians found within the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and thus create a new Orthodox Church within the boundaries of another one. Schism was officially declared in the Great Synod of 1872 in Phanar and healed in 1945. From 1953 to 1961 there was once more an anomaly in the relations of the two Churches, but this ended with the recognition of the Patriarchal status of the Bulgarian Church by the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Church government in the Patriarchate did not undergo any great changes, but some important readjustments to meet the new needs were made. At the head of that Church was the Patriarch. His election until 1923 was made by a special electoral assembly, composed of metropolitans, officials and laymen. This was done on three names by a majority vote or the exclamation *axios* (he is worthy). From 1860 to 1923 the synod of metropolitans had the right of electing one among the three names presented by the special assembly. Since 1923 the whole process of election has

been carried out by the endemousa synod, without the presence of any lay participants. The general rule has become to elect a patriarch among the metropolitans. There are examples, though, of Ecumenical Patriarchs having been elected from other patriarchal or autocephalous sees. Within the Turkish Republic, the Patriarch should be a Turkish citizen, with the single exception of Athenagoras (1948–), a former American citizen. In 1923 the official installation of the Patriarch by the state stopped; however, his ecclesiastical enthronement is still done as in the old days. The Patriarch's residence followed the wanderings of the patriarchal cathedral Churches: (1) SS. Apostles (1453-5); (2) Pammakaristos (1455-1586); (3) Panaghia Paramythia Wallach Saray (1586-1597); (4) St. Demetrios of Xyloporta (1597-1599); and (5) St. George in Phanar (1600–). Another residence of the Patriarch was in Kuru Shesme of the Bosphorus. At present, his summer residence is in the Theological School of Halki. The revenues of the Patriarchate were of two kinds: the regular and the irregular ones, the revenues of the patriarch and of the patriarchate. All these were not enough to cover the greatly mounting debt of the Patriarchate (*chreos tou koinou*). A positive step to meet this was the establishment of a committee of finance (first in 1564), which started functioning regularly from the middle of the eighteenth century.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century the Patriarch had absolute authority in dealing with Church affairs, because of the absence of the regular synodical regime. The only body in this period existing besides him was that of the officials, who had assumed a real power, stronger than that of the endemousa synod. From the nineteenth century on, and in our own times, these offices have almost lost their real meaning and have become honorary. Their catalogue at the present has been greatly augmented.

The synodical regime was operated in the form of the major synods, meeting in the Patriarchate in the presence of delegates from other Orthodox Churches, monks and laymen, and dealing with important problems; and of the extraordinary and the endemousa synods, as before. From the middle of the eighteenth century on the endemousa synod developed on a permanent and regular basis. The reasons for this development were the presence of metropolitans in the finance committee, their efforts to curtail the absolutism of the Patriarch and to curb the great powers of the officials; the main reason, however, is the appearance

of the so-called system of gerontism (mid-eighteenth century to mid-nineteenth century) which took this name from the geronts, metropolitans of high rank and neighboring sees who thus were able to be continuously present in the patriarchal synod, to elect their candidates to the patriarchal and other sees, to act as delegates of other metropolitans in the capital, and thus to assume a great power. Geronts were the metropolitans of Caesarea, Ephesos, Heracleia, Kyzikos, Nicaea, Nicomedia, Chalcedon, and Derkos. Gerontism coincides chronologically with the period of the Phanariots, who because of their position were immediately interested in Church affairs.

The General Regulations (1858-1862), prepared by a special assembly in the Patriarchate and confirmed by the Ottoman state, put an end to Gerontism. These conditioned the life of the Church until 1923. Some articles, not affected by the political change, are still valid. Those regulations deal with the patriarch, the metropolitans, the Holy Synod, the mixed council, finances, personnel of the Patriarchate, and the monasteries. The Holy Synod, composed of twelve members and chaired by the Patriarch, considered spiritual matters, while the permanent national mixed council (assembly), composed of four synodical members and seven laymen, dealt with matters affecting external life of the Church. The latter stopped functioning in 1923, and so the participation of laymen became a dead letter. Since then, the only remaining body is the permanent Holy Synod, which has several synodical committees, consisting of clergy and some lay persons.

After the fall of the city, the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate covered a wide area. All Orthodox Christians within the Empire and others outside of it were under the Patriarchate, leaving out those of the ancient patriarchates and the Church of Cyprus. This jurisdiction covered the areas of the Balkans, the Ionian and the Aegean islands, Asia Minor, and parts of Russia. The independent archbishopric of Tirnovo seems to have become a diocese of the patriarchate after the Council of Florence (1439). Beginning with the year 1448, the Metropolitan of Moscow was appointed by the state in Russia. The elevation of that Church to the rank of a patriarchate was decided upon by the Great Synod in Istanbul (1593), presided over by the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II. The Patriarchate continued to send metropolitans to the Ukraine. Financial difficulties and the need for protection should be accepted as reasons for the subjection of the inde-

pendent diocese of Ipek (1766) and Ochrida (1767) to the Patriarchate. In the nineteenth century, the era of nationalism in the Balkans, Orthodox Churches there followed the example of the new states being established in this area. This continued in the twentieth century. The Ecumenical Patriarchate with patriarchal and synodical tomes (acts) bestowed an autonomous, an autocephalous, and in some cases a patriarchal status to those Churches. The interchange of populations between Turkey and Greece in 1922 left the Patriarchate with hardly any members in Asia Minor. But with the continuous immigration of Greek Orthodox to the Americas, Australia, and Europe, the establishment there of dioceses, exarchies, and communities depending on the Patriarchate, its jurisdiction is being presently extended all over the world, thus geographically giving to the Patriarchate a real ecumenical status.

This Patriarchate left for a period of time (1908-1922) the government of the Greek Orthodox in the Diaspora to the Church of Greece. The Archdiocese of North and South America and the Metropolis (Archdiocese 1954-1963) of Thyateira (and of Great Britain since 1964) were founded in 1922. Central Europe was a metropolis in the years 1924-1936. Parts of the Archdiocese of Thyateira have been taken to form the three new metropoleis of France, Germany, and Austria (1963). The Metropolis (Archdiocese since 1959) of Australia and New Zealand was founded in 1924. Today, besides the above, the Patriarchate has four metropoleis and some others without a flock within Turkey, those of "New Chora" in Greece, left temporarily to the Church of Greece, the metropoleis in Crete and Dodecanese, the Russian exarchate in Western Europe, the autonomous archbishoprics or metropoleis of Estonia (1923), Latvia (1923), Finland (1918, 1923) and Czechoslovakia (1923), and the monastic state of Mt. Athos and the island of Patmos. The number of faithful under the Patriarchate in Turkey is greatly diminishing (50,000?), while all over the world it totals 2.5 million persons.

The metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops were the highest ecclesiastical rulers in their dioceses. In the third order we come across an evolution from the lower in organization to the higher. The different bishoprics, which depended on the metropolitans, eventually take the names of archbishoprics, but they also directly get a promotion to the rank of a metropolis. The last remains of the ancient canonical status of a metropolitan with diocesan

bishops in Crete is no more a reality (since 1962). With the beginning of the seventeenth century, we once more meet titular bishops serving either in the Patriarchate or in the different metropolises. At present, the heads of some autonomous Churches and some metropolitans are known as archbishops.

The Ecumenical Patriarch keeps his pre-eminence of honor among the sister Orthodox Churches. This, in practice, means certain rights accorded to him by the Ecumenical Synods and the long life and tradition of the Church. In general, his right of initiative is recognized by the heads of all Orthodox Churches. In particular, he has the right of appeal from all other sister Churches, the right to start a correspondence on one or more important problems, call Pan-Orthodox synods and preside over them, confer autonomy, autocephalicity, and the patriarchal status to Churches formerly remaining under it, bless the holy myron and send it to the sister Orthodox Churches, and be the first in the concelebrations during worship services together with other Orthodox prelates. The three ancient patriarchates, beginning with the Arabic conquest and during the Ottoman period, had been greatly impoverished and diminished. Their patriarchs were, until the middle of the nineteenth century, for the most part elected, with the canonical assent of their Churches, by the patriarchal synod in Phanar, and remained in the city. The Ecumenical Patriarch, because of his residence in the capital, on many occasions directly dealt with matters related to the other Orthodox churches. This should not be regarded as a move of the Patriarch to gain a *de facto* primacy over the Orthodox world, but as an outcome of his duty to assist the other Orthodox Churches in their difficulties.

One can draw a long list of Pan-Orthodox or other synods held in Istanbul during this period. The Patriarchate recognized the Church of Russia as a patriarchate in 1589/1593; and gave autocephalicity to the Church of Greece in 1850; it gave autonomy to the Church of Serbia in 1831, autocephalicity in 1879, and patriarchal status in 1922; it gave autocephalicity to the Church of Rumania in 1885 and patriarchal status in 1925; it gave autocephalicity to the Church of Poland in 1924; it gave autocephalicity to the Church of Albania in 1937; it gave autocephalicity to the Church of Bulgaria in 1945 and patriarchal status in 1961.

The famous correspondence started by Joacheim III (1902-4) constitutes a good beginning in interorthodox relations during the

present century. Meetings of inter or pan Orthodox character, called by the Ecumenical Patriarchate are: (1) The Pan-Orthodox congress of Istanbul, 1923, which decided to change the Julian calendar and discussed other issue of a practical and canonical nature; (2) The Pan-Orthodox conference of Mt. Athos (1930) and Rhodes (1961), which prepared the agenda for the coming Pan-Orthodox prosynod; (3) The second Pan-Orthodox conference in Rhodes (1963), which touched upon the problem of Orthodox delegated observers to the Second Vatican Council, and decided to start a "dialogue on equal terms" with Rome; (4) The Third Pan-Orthodox conference in Rhodes (1964) to discuss ways in which dialogue with Rome should be conducted. The Patriarchate organized the festivities on the millennium of Mt. Athos (1963); and it sent delegates to two celebrations in Moscow — on the 500th anniversary of the autocephalicity of the Church of Russia (1948), and on the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate (1958); it sent delegates to Greece on the 1900th anniversary of the coming of St. Paul to Greece (1950/1951); it sent delegates to Thessalonike on the celebration of the 600th anniversary of the death of St. Gregory Palamas (1959). Patriarch Athenagoras paid a visit to the three ancient patriarchates of the East in 1959, and was happy to accept all the heads or the representatives of the sister Orthodox Churches in his see. Finally, the international Orthodox youth organization called "Syndesmos" works with the blessings of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Monasteries and monks have been respected by the new rulers. Monasteries have served many purposes. They were centers for piety, for the life of prayer and solitude, centers serving the education of those living within their confines and of children, centers for keeping manuscripts and books, and centers where many great men, patriarchs, bishops, confessors, teachers, preachers, secretaries, came from. Monks still live one of the three forms of monastic life, the eremitic, the cenobitic or the idiorrhythmic one. The most important monastic center is Mt. Athos, which celebrated its millennium in 1963. A special synodical committee on the affairs of Mt. Athos functions in the Patriarchate. Formerly, there were monasteries in Istanbul, the islands of Marmara, the most important of which is of the Holy Trinity in Halki, on the island of Patmos, some in Crete and the Dodecanese, and two within the Church of Greece (in Thessalonike and in Chalkidike).



The number of monks living within these monasteries is not on the increase. In the Patriarchate there is a special synodical committee for monasteries.

Worship at this period lost its external magnificence. Few churches remained in the hands of Christians and those built on the foundations of the old were made of wood, lacking a dome. From the middle of the eighteenth century and especially in the nineteenth century, thanks to the financial position of the Greek Orthodox and the permission of the authorities, many new churches were built and others rebuilt from the old. Church bells started again to be heard. Newly built churches were of the basilica or the Cross type with domes. In our days, especially in the United States, there are churches of modern architectural type. Holy sacraments and religious services were continuously being conducted. In the first centuries immediately after the Fall the liturgy was performed during the night. This stopped in the nineteenth century. Preaching was done where and whenever there were men able to do so. Many names of eloquent preachers fill the catalogues of this period. Preaching became more regular after the foundation of theological and ecclesiastical schools. Byzantine Church music was influenced by the Turkish and later the European music. Several patriarchs tried to establish schools of Byzantine music in Phanar. Several cantors of the Patriarchate are among the most famous servants of this music. The Church calendar is being enriched with the addition of neo-martyrs and confessors, and by bringing back feasts from the past. At the Pan-Orthodox congress of Istanbul (1923) the Ecumenical Patriarchate introduced in its ecclesiastical life the new or Gregorian calendar, but without changing the celebration of Easter.

During these years, in which help was badly needed by almost all members of the Church, the Patriarchate took the lead in the sphere of philanthropy, by establishing different houses, helping the poor and the sick, and freeing the captives. Mention of the first hospital in Istanbul is made in 1520, but hospitals in the modern sense were founded in different parts of the city in the eighteenth century. In 1836, with the construction of the new hospitals in Balikli outside the walls, all former hospitals were moved to this new site; it still exists and is efficiently run in the present. In the twentieth century, clinics within the grounds of some parish Churches offer medical care and medicine to the patients free of charge. The first orphanage was founded in Istanbul.

bul by the Ecumenical Patriarch Germanos IV in 1853; today it is located on the island of Buyukada (Prinkipo), one of the Princes' Islands. Last but not least is the work done in this field by the philanthropic societies. What has been said about the work of philanthropy in Istanbul applies to a smaller or a greater extent to the work carried on in the dioceses of the Patriarchate, both within Turkey and all over the world.

After the Fall of the capital, education in general continued to bear its ecclesiastical character. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century, we have in education the period of theocracy, while after that, with the foundation of universities, it takes a secular and a humanistic form.

Clergy and theologians in general received their education either in grammar or secondary schools, where education was mostly based on ecclesiastical books, and teachers were either priests or monks. In secondary education, theological courses formed a part in the regular curriculum. The most famous of all the secondary schools was the patriarchal school or academy, founded by Gennadius Scholarios. Monasteries continued to serve as centers for learning either in general or in an organized way through the ecclesiastical schools being established within their grounds (The Athonian Academy, 1753, the Patmias Academy, 1713). Education in general remained under the supervision of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which tried to reorganize it in the nineteenth century. During World War I Greek schools within the Ottoman Empire were put under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Education.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, theology within the Ecumenical Patriarchate still bore its Byzantine marks. A general characteristic of this period was the upholding of tradition and attachment to the Fathers. Because of discussions with the Latins, polemic theology came first in line. In the seventeenth century, with the coming of Protestants to the East, this new religious movement was included in those discussions. This direct confrontation of other confessions led to a positive exposition of Orthodox teaching and a negation to the heterodox doctrines. From then until the end of the nineteenth century, Orthodox theology was under Roman Catholic or Protestant influences, and eventually acquired a scientific mark. The desire to keep a record of the different events and persons of those times led to the writing of chronicles and Church histories. In the practical field, preach-

ing and the lives of saints are of importance.

Some factors, like proselytism, new ideas coming from the West, scientific inquiry at the service of theology, and the foundation of theological schools, brought a rebirth to Orthodox theology in the second half of the nineteenth century. At present, the challenge of the Ecumenical Movement should also be taken into consideration. Today Orthodox theology within the confines of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, as with the whole of Orthodoxy, tries to eliminate all external influences of the past, to revive in a dynamic way the patristic tradition, to take into consideration Western theology, and to promote the unity of Orthodoxy in all spheres of life. Clergy, monks, and laymen, that is, all members of the Church, serve Orthodox theology.

Since 1844 the Theological School of Halki has been at the service of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, meeting its needs for clergy and giving form to the new theological trends, within which the Patriarchate had to move. Directly attached to the patriarchal dioceses in the Diaspora are the two theological institutions of St. Sergios in Paris (1925) and Holy Cross in Brookline, Massachusetts (1937). Mention should be made here of various libraries, containing manuscripts and publications, such as the Patriarchal, the library of the Theological School of Halki and other Theological Schools, in the monasteries of Mt. Athos and Patmos, and elsewhere. Lukaris first organized the Patriarchal Press at Phanar (1627). This worked with intervals and was lastly at the service of the Patriarchate from 1951 to 1964. Lastly, the periodicals of the Patriarchate — *Ecclesiastike Aletheia* (1880-1923), *Neos Poimen* (1919-1923), *Orthodoxia* (1926-1963), and *Apostolos Andreas* (1951-1964) — should be accepted as important tools in the service of theology.

#### THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF HALKI

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# HAGIOGRAPHY IN RELATION TO ICONOCLASM\*

By ARISTEIDIS PAPADAKIS

For the researcher, no area of Byzantine literature lies in such darkness and confusion as does hagiography. It is like a dense virgin forest both endless and dark whose extent is boundless and into which no path leads.<sup>1</sup>

## I

Despite the feeling of some historians that the medieval biographer, both Byzantine and Western, was a mediocre, illiterate, low-brow monk with a strong bent for the miraculous,<sup>2</sup> students of history have been increasingly interested in hagiographical material during the past fifty years.<sup>3</sup> Although some Lives of the

---

\* The substance of this article forms part of a dissertation submitted to the Department of History, Fordham University, with the title, "Iconoclasm: A Study of the Hagiographical Evidence." The unedited *Vita Euthymii Sardensis* (= *Bodleianus Laudianus Graecus* 69) was also examined; I hope to publish Euthymius' biography very soon.

<sup>1</sup> Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897), p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> See Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 63 ("at least three fourths of the lives of the saints of the high middle ages can teach us nothing about those pious personages whose careers they pretend to describe.") Kindred contempt is to be found in the remarks of C. Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des Byzantinischen Reiches von den Kreuzzügen* (Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker und Humblot, 1894), p. vii ("Das Schulmeister und Monchsbyzanz ist eine Scheinfassade. Diese Scheinfassade muss weggebrochen werden, damit man zu den grossen und denkwürdigen Problemen byzantinischer Geschichte gelangen kann.") The reference is to Byzantine literature but can be equally applied to hagiology. Cf. also the reservations of A. Lombard, *Constantin V, Empereur des Romains* (Paris: Felix Alcan, Éditeur, 1902), p. 68, who believes many of the Lives of the eighth century have "le caractère de la légende."

<sup>3</sup> Those who did so much for Byzantine hagiography and are responsible for making it a legitimate field of endeavor are Karl Krumbacher, P. van den Gheyn, A. Ehrhard, V. Vassilievsky, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, and of course H. Delehay. See the comments of L. Bréhier, "L'hagiographie byzantine des VIII<sup>e</sup> et IX<sup>e</sup> siècles à Constantinople et dans les Provinces," *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 395. No further data will be given on these authors since their work will be cited again and again in the pages following. The services of H. Delehay (in many ways so durable) require special mention, however. In 1895 he under-

saints admittedly tax credulity with their dense bramble of fabulous fact, hagiography is an area of incalculable historical value.

This study examines some eighth- and ninth-century hagiographical material that reveals insights into the iconoclastic controversy rarely met with in other documents. An effort is made to show that this material reveals about that controversy certain otherwise unknown currents within the Byzantine Church (what Dobschütz called "Strömungen"),<sup>4</sup> certain opinions (of ecclesiastics, emperors), a certain thought-world, and a vast and valuable amount of historical data. But even further, it can be argued that it reveals — with minor gaps — the whole issue of image-worship which the experienced researcher can reconstruct rather accurately. The oft-held view that hagiography's usefulness is meagre in the extreme and its study beneath the dignity of the researcher must be laid to rest.

## II

There has been, accordingly, an increasing use of this uniquely medieval genre, first because all remains of the past, however insignificant, must be investigated, and second because hagiography contains material not found in other documents.

The *Life of St. Stephen the Younger*,<sup>5</sup> by way of example, not only contains a detailed description of the persecution under Constantine V (741-775) but refers to many individuals who are known solely through this document. The *Life* (written by Stephen the deacon during the first decade of the ninth century) is

---

took to catalogue the scattered Greek extant hagiographical MSS. This resulted in the now indispensable tool known as the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1895). F. Halkin has edited the most recent third edition (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1957). The monumental work of Delehaye is however the *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* which appeared in the *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris* (Brussels: 1902). The Synaxarion is the collection of brief accounts of saints' Lives appointed to be read at Matins in the Eastern Church. It is thus an official liturgical document dealing with the cultus of saints as observed by the Byzantines. On the Synaxarion see the excellent remarks of R. Aigrain, *L'Hagiographie* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1953), p. 72f.

<sup>4</sup> Ernest von Dobschütz, "Methodios und die Studiten," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVIII (1909), p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> *Vita Stephani Junioris* in *P.G.*, Vol. 100, cols. 1069-1186.

one of the longest we possess and has been extensively used by historians, at times to the exclusion of other *Lives*. The Bollandists have employed it to fix both the chronology of the period and to reconstruct a list of the martyrs of this reign.<sup>6</sup> The hero of the work was himself martyred during the reign of Constantine for being the leading figure in the resistance to the government's policy.

Some of these sources, such as the *Life of St. Romanos*, constitute the oldest sources we have for iconoclasm.<sup>7</sup> According to its editor, it was written in 780-787. Chronologically, therefore, it belongs to the first period of iconoclasm before the Council of Nicaea in 787. The importance of this becomes evident when we realize the paucity of our sources for the first period of iconoclasm. It should be added at this point that the historian is at advantage inasmuch as he can control these *Lives* by the more official documents of the period. Almost always the more outrageous statements can be controlled by checking them against the evidence of non-hagiographical documents. Similarly, the process may work the other way. The *Vita Tarasii*, for example, is rich in historical material even deserving greater credit than the more official literature; it can serve as a corroborative document to Theophanes and to the *Acta* of 787.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See *A.S. Octobris*, VIII, p. 128f. Cf., however, the remarks of Lombard *Constantin*, p. 6, who believes this list of martyrs is founded on slender evidence and that the *Life* is not entirely trustworthy. He notes, for example, that the document states the election of Patriarch Constantine occurred before the Council of 754. Yet we know from other sources that Constantine did not preside over the Council but that Theodosius of Ephesus did; Constantine was nominated *after* the Council.

<sup>7</sup> This *Life*, with an introduction and a Latin translation, has been edited by P. Peeters, "S. Romain le neomartyr (1 mai 780) d'après un document géorgien," *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXX (1911), 393-427. On the *Life* see further Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (I. Müller and W. Otto, ed. *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, XII; Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlag-buchhandlung, 1959), p. 508.

<sup>8</sup> I. A. Heikel (ed.), *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, XVII (1891), pp. 391-439. G. da Costa-Louillet, "Saints de Constantinople aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Byzantion*, XXIV (1954), p. 226, in referring to this text's description of the Council of 787 says, "dans ce passage, elle apparaît plus digne de foi que l'historiographie officielle." Cf. The *Vita Joannicii*, *A.S. Novembris*, II, pp. 344, 346 and the *Vita Nicetae*, *A.S.*

It goes almost without saying, that many things have conspired to make the iconoclastic controversy an altogether difficult question for the modern historian. To begin with, much of the "raw material" so necessary to the student of history has been wittingly destroyed or lost — at least a good part of it.<sup>9</sup> This is largely due to the decision of the Seventh Council and no doubt to the spirit of the times. The iconoclasts suffered the same fate as other heretical groups of the past, that is, we know doctrine only by way of their opponents. As a consequence, the sources of the eighth and early ninth centuries are singularly one-sided. The significance of this fact and the obstacle it presents to the historian, who wishes to work with academic detachment, is obvious. He must perforce be ever on his guard.

This is particularly true of hagiography. By no stretch of the imagination is the hagiographical dossier free of prejudices. Indeed the documents are particularly partisan, and they, like the Byzantine historian and chronicler, adopt an iconophile point of view. They have their own *Weltanschauung* insofar as they were written by a segment of Byzantine society which was of one mind and accordingly could not be expected to give a true idea of the full complexity of that society. Having recognized this and admitted that their initial purpose is one of "edification," the historian must still concede the fact that they do have appreciable

---

Aprilis, I, XXIX, in which the libelous portrait of Nicephorus I by Theophanes is corrected by the complimentary and decidedly non-defamatory statements of hagiographers.

<sup>9</sup> The theological writings, edicts, the official acts of the iconoclastic emperors have not survived. All that has been salvaged, for example, of the pseudo-Council of 754 — so important to an understanding of the theological position of the iconoclast — is its Definition (Horos) preserved in the Acts of the Council of 787. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence: 1902), XIII, 205-363. Consult Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 67-68, for a resumé of all extant iconoclastic writings. A rich detailed bibliography of sources (including secondary material culled by Louis Bréhier) can be found in chapter XIII of Grégoire Le Grand *Les États Barbares*, Vol. V of *Histoire de l'Eglise*, ed. Augustine Fliche and Victor Martin (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1938), pp. 431-33. See also George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. M. Hussey (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957), pp. 130-34. Ostrogorsky has demonstrated that Constantine V wrote theological diatribes, fragments of which are to be found in orthodox writers as for example Patriarch Nicephorus.



interest.<sup>10</sup> However partisan or slanted they may be they still mirror the story of one of the great conflicts in all Byzantine history.

It is to be borne in mind that it is these so-called "partial" sources that provide us with information about the bishops in Asia Minor who first began a local iconoclastic campaign. The implication is that it is the bishops of the Church who influenced Leo III or at least provided the inspiration for the movement. There are numerous references in hagiography to bishops of the Church who were presumably canonically consecrated and who went over to the heretical camp. One would think that the Orthodox monk-biographer would wish to conceal these facts insofar as the magisterium of the Church is revealed in an unfavorable light and would be embarrassing to it. Yet this is not at all the case.<sup>11</sup>

The vast vacuum in Byzantium's cultural life from 650-850 is nothing less than overwhelming. The preceding epoch was, in large measure, one of the most dynamically creative periods in Byzantine history. If the age after Heraclius was in truth so barren in the field of learning and literature, "eine trostlose Verödung" at once unexpected and sudden,<sup>12</sup> it was not so in the field of hagiography. Indeed, the late eighth and ninth centuries were the golden age of Byzantine hagiography.<sup>13</sup> Seldom was there an age in the history of Byzantium more eminently suited for the exercise of this discipline, already some four centuries old.

The period was singularly productive because of the monumental proportions achieved by iconoclasm under Constantine V and Leo V.<sup>14</sup> The persecution gave to all, but especially to the

---

<sup>10</sup> Delehaye does not believe Eusebius' description of the great persecution in his *History* is a hagiographical document "... to be strictly hagiographical the document must be of a religious character and aim at edification. The term then must be confined to writings inspired by religious devotion to the saints and intended to increase that devotion." *The Legends of the Saints* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1962), p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Encounter with bishops: cf. V. Laurent (ed.), *La Vie Merveilleuse de Saint Pierre d'Atroa* (*Subsidia Hagiographica*, no. 29; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1956), p. 111.

<sup>12</sup> Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 12.

<sup>13</sup> H. Beck, p. 506.

<sup>14</sup> The author of the iconoclastic policy of the Syrian dynasty, Leo III, did not carry persecution on so a large scale as his son and subsequent rulers were to do. This is confirmed by Leo III's initial reluctance to come forth with an official pronouncement against images. Such an official

monk, the opportunity of achieving a greater martyrdom than that possible in the coenobium. These numerous witnesses of iconophiles subsequently became the heroes of the monastic biographer, inasmuch as the tendency was natural for the monastery to want to perpetuate the memory of those monk-confessors who had enhanced the community by their "exploits."<sup>15</sup> Beside, it was the monks who ultimately won a laudable moral victory over the iconoclasts — a fact often expressed but rarely assimilated and a fact to which the biographies are a cogent witness.

The lives and views of such powerful personalities as the monks Joannikios, Nicetas, Theodore, Plato, Peter of Atroa, Euthymios of Sardis, the Stylite Symeon and his brother George, Theophylactus of Nicomedia, Stephen the Younger (these are only a few of the biographies we have), played a prominent role in the conflict and attracted the attention of both parties. All this, of course, at once explains the proliferation of this literary genre at this period and the fact that the monasteries were, in the main, the centers of production.<sup>16</sup>

---

edict did not appear until 730 — some thirteen years after his accession to the throne. As for the number of *Lives* produced, cf. Louis Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 359, who gives the following figures: twenty *Lives* for the sixth century, thirteen for the seventh, and eleven for the tenth. In contrast we have some sixty *Lives* of the eighth and ninth centuries. Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 180, places the decline of Byzantine hagiology in the eleventh century.

<sup>15</sup> It is instructive when we are given explicit information that Joseph, abbot (hegoumenos) of Antidion, asked Sabas to write the *Life of Joannikios* or when Epiphanius, St. Stephen's successor, ordered the deacon Stephen to write the *Life of Stephen*. See *Vita Joannicii* in A.S. November, II, p. 333; *Vita Stephani Junioris* in P.G., Vol. 100, col. 1184.

<sup>16</sup> It was pointed out some time ago by A. Ehrhard that these *Lives* in their existing form belong in most cases to the ninth century. See Dobshütz, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVIII (1909), p. 41. This in itself is significant inasmuch as it confirms the above and verifies the paradox that the iconoclastic heresy (the cause of so much barrenness) exercised a considerable role on the so-called renaissance of the ninth century. In the words of F. Dvornik, the heresy provoked this revival. See his penetrating chapter IV on the literary and religious renaissance of the ninth century in *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1926), p. 107f. One thinks of the Macedonian renaissance as chiefly concerned with art, thereby ignoring one of its most salient features — the Bardas University and Photius, perhaps its most prominent member. One of the most succinct and brief statements of this "humanistic" movement has been made by the eminent Byzantine art

A kindred reason (that explains the abundance of these encomia) is the extraordinary growth and influence of monasticism within the Eastern Church during this period.<sup>17</sup> The East early inherited Egyptian monasticism, appropriated it, developed it, and gave it a central role within the life of the Church. Yet, it is from the eighth century onwards that monasticism began to make serious inroads into the cultural and religious complex of Byzantium, at the very structure of Byzantine society.<sup>18</sup> One example will suffice. Antony, the soldier-saint and personal deputy of the Emperor Michael II (820-829) rejected the pleading of the latter and left his high and influential office to become a monk. That even a high army officer in Asia Minor could turn to the monastic life illustrates the magnetism of monasticism at this time. Antony was an iconodule.<sup>19</sup> A glance at the hagiographical documents cannot fail to buttress the conviction that the

---

historian Kurt Weitzmann, *Geistige Grundlagen und Wesen der Makedonischen Renaissance* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1963).

<sup>17</sup> Between the period 705 and 1205 no fewer than 45 monks were elected to the patriarchate of Constantinople (the total number of Patriarchs during this period was 53). See L. Bréhier, "Le recrutement des patriarches de Constantinople pendant la période byzantine," *Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> Congrès Internationale des Etudes Byzantines* (Paris: 1950), I, pp. 221-227. Some of the reasons for this astonishing influence are discussed by Demosthenes Savramis, *Zur Soziologie de Byzantinischen Mönchtums* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 71f.

<sup>18</sup> Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 180, places this evident preference for the monk in hagiography as early as the fourth century. In the monk the Church recognized, "ses porte-paroles authentiques. Elle adopta leur liturgie, leur spiritualité, leur type de sainteté . . . en fait, les moins formaient durant tout le Moyen Age, l'élite de la société chrétienne en Orient." Jean Meyendorff, *St. Grégoire Palamas et la Mystique Orthodoxe* (Paris: Aux Éditions du Seuil, 1959), p. 17. The rapid expansion of the movement in Asia Minor is illustrated by the fact that in 536 the diocese of Chalcedon alone already had some 39 monasteries for men. See the fine summary of this development by O. Rousseau, "Le rôle important du monachisme dans l'Eglise d'Orient," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 153 (1958), p. 43f. The entire issue is devoted to Eastern monasticism. H. Delehay's essay "Byzantine Monasticism" in N. H. Baynes and H. St. L. B. Moss, *Byzantium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), pp. 136-165 and J. M. Hussey's article similarly titled in *History*, XXIV (1939), p. 56-62 are sound and absorbing introductions. The most extensive bibliography on the subject will be found in H. Beck, pp. 120-122.

<sup>19</sup> *Vita Antonii Junioris*, edited by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Pravoslavni Palestinski Sbornik*, 57 (1907), pp. 146-216.

crisis both revived and gave a new lease on life to Byzantine monasticism. One of the chief contributors to this revival was Theodore of the monastery of Studios. We are more prone to think of Theodore as the great supporter of Orthodoxy — another Athanasius, as it were — rather than the serious reformer of Eastern monasticism which he undoubtedly was.<sup>20</sup> This is a mistaken and singularly one-sided approach to this remarkable figure.

But however abundant and valuable this corpus of sources may be, Krumbacher's remarks, made some fifty years ago, are still pertinent today. The Great Byzantinist had noted then that Byzantine hagiography was like a dense virgin forest into which no light seemed to penetrate.<sup>21</sup> To be sure, a Byzantinist today would not dare investigate any area of the Byzantine landscape without a thorough consideration of the hagiographic evidence.<sup>22</sup> The tools of Byzantine research — one thinks of the new lexica, numismatics, seals, the rediscovery of the art of forgotten churches — have advanced appreciably since Krumbacher wrote.<sup>23</sup> Yet the fact remains that of all fields of Byzantine literature, hagiography is the least explored. Actually, a real assessment of the historical import of the hagiographic documents pertinent to the iconoclastic

---

<sup>20</sup> The nearest approach to a "rule" for the Eastern monk is the Studite enforcement of Basilian principles. Like St. Basil, he too favored coenobitic over eremitical monasticism. On the reforms of Theodore and their consequences see J. Leroy, "La réforme Studite," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 153 (1958), pp. 181-214. Also the important article by C. Papadopoulos, "St. Theodore of Studios in his struggle for the holy images," (in Greek), *Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*, 15 (1939), pp. 3-37. Also E. Amann's article "Théodore, le Studite" in A. Vacant (ed.) *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (Paris, 1946), XV, cols. 287-298.

<sup>21</sup> Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 176.

<sup>22</sup> Witness, for example, the recent use of hagiography for the extraction of material on the history of medicine, H. J. Magoulias, "The Lives of the saints as sources of data for the history of Byzantine medicine in the sixth and seventh centuries," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 57 (1964), p. 127f. Another illustration is the successful attempt of F. Dvornik to cull information about elementary education in Byzantium by way of the hagiography of the ninth century. See his *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* ("Byzantinoslavica, Supplementa I; Prague: Commissionnaire "Orbis," 1933), pp. 25-33.

<sup>23</sup> The most cursory reader in current Byzantine historiography will not fail to notice the astonishing fact that the Byzantine State has become an intelligible area of historical research in its own right. However, the By-

period has yet to be made. There is no exhaustive study of them.<sup>24</sup> There are a number of monographs on some of the documents for the express purpose of illustrating this or that point. However, no attempt has been made to cull all their information, corroborate it with current research, and present a synthesis. This may be due to the suspicion under which hagiography has labored for so long. (Admittedly, the thick volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum* look forbidding even to the most unremitting student and do not always make for entertainment.) But more likely it is part of the general neglect of the entire controversy, which one may go so far as to say has not been studied either critically or adequately. Manifestly this condition renders the documents and the field an irresistible challenge to the assiduous scholar.

### III

Before employing these documents as historical data it is necessary to digress for a space and make a brief examination of the genre. An understanding of their chief features (quite ubiquitous), of the rules with which they were composed, and of the thought-world they infallibly reflect is prerequisite to an appreciation of the value of the witness the *Lives* furnish us. To the novice researcher the knowledge is basic in that it will help him distinguish between the essential and the non-essential, between the historical and the hagiographical. Without this knowledge

---

zantine story is far from completed. A total historical synthesis of Byzantine civilization remains a most urgent desideratum. It will probably continue to be an "interim report" until our sources, many still unprinted and inaccessible, become known. See the article by K. Weitzmann, "Byzantine art and scholarship in America," *American Journal of Archaeology*, II (1947), p. 394. See also a review by J. M. Hussey in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 50 (1949), p. 235.

<sup>24</sup> C. Loparev, *Vizantiyskiya zhitiya svyatykh viii i ix vekov*, was the first to make a critical analysis of these works and attempt to show how they can be employed to complement or control the more familiar historical sources. Loparev's work needs to be translated into a more accessible language. L. Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), XV (1917), has given a lengthy resumé of Loparev's work. The latest in analysis with good bibliographies has been done by G. de Costa-Louillet, "Saints de Sicile et d'Italie Meridionale aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Byzantion*, XXIX-XXX (1959-1960), pp. 89-173; "Saints de Constantinople aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles," XXIV (1954), pp. 179-263; XXV-XXVI-XXVII (1955-56-57), pp. 784-851.

it would be impossible to differentiate between the stereotype elements and those details which constitute the valuable historical detail one is looking for.

These ἀγιόγραφα, as the Byzantines called them, fall into three classes: μαρτύρια, accounts dealing with martyrs, βίοι, ordinary biographies, and finally ἐγκώμια, encomiastic panegyrics of saints.<sup>25</sup> There are of course frequent exceptions, and some *Lives* are a mixture of more than one of these forms. The ἐπιτάφιος of Nicetas, abbot of Medicium (a most valuable document of the period under discussion) is actually a striking example of the last two forms.<sup>26</sup> The *Life of Plato* by his nephew Theodore of Studios is another salient example. It is a funeral oration; however, it preserves faithfully the schema of the βίος and relates the entire story of the saint's life.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Similarly Latin hagiography is divided into *passiones*, *vitae*, and *laudationes*, cf. P. R. Norton, "The biographical form of the Vitae Sanctorum," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 26 (1925), p. 256. For μαρτύριον the use of words such as ἀθλησις and ἀγῶνες is frequently encountered. This last form is more prone to overlook the life of the martyr and concentrate on the actual martyrdom (baptism by blood). Chronologically, it is also the earliest of all forms. The ἐγκώμιον is also known as λόγος ἐγκωμιαστικός, ὑπόμνημα, ὁμιλία, λόγος, λόγος ἐπελευστικός. Frequently they constitute the sermons given on the saint's day, hence the abundance of panegyric. The third form at times as changed to βίος καὶ πολιτεία (Latin: *vita et conversatio*, *vita et gesta*, *vita et institutum*, etc.). Sometimes the words are found separately along with πράξεις, ἱστορία, διήγησις, etc. (*acta*, *historia*, *narratio*). They were primarily written for edification and devotional purposes. Cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 180.

<sup>26</sup> The peroration of this work has βίος καὶ πολιτεία while the heading has ἐπιτάφιος. The work will be found in the *A.S.* Aprilis, I, pp. XVII-XXVII. Usually the beginning paragraph will also provide some additional epithet for the saint which is done to designate his "rank," as it were. The two most often used are ἅγιος (saint) and ὅσιος (holy) — the latter denoting a lesser position. The formal expression (borrowed from the liturgy) indicating that the saint has been canonized by the Church is ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις πατὴρ ἡμῶν (our father among the saints). The word νέος can mean the new, the second or the younger. The classic example of the latter is of course the *Vita Stephani Junioris*, *P.G.*, Vol. 100, cols. 1069-1186. Cf. L. Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 361f., for hagiographical titlature.

<sup>27</sup> *Laudatio S. Platonis Hegumeni*, in *P.G.*, Vol. 99, cols. 804-850. Cf. the remarks of H. Delehay, *Mélanges d'Hagiographie Grecque et Latine* (*Subsidia Hagiographica*, no. 42; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1966), p. 125 ("Sans doute en hagiographie, il n'y a pas de différence substanti-

Byzantine hagiography, the writing of the lives of the saints, has, to be sure, a predetermined shape and is really the product of several centuries. It may be said to have originated with Athanasius in the fourth century. The influence of his classic *Vita Antonii* — an original echo of the Egyptian desert — was far-reaching and all-embracing. It is difficult for anyone who deals with hagiography to ignore the Athanasian original inasmuch as it determined all subsequent literature of this type.<sup>28</sup> The traditional scheme of the biography of the Byzantine saint is basically that of Athanasius.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, the pious Byzantine who set about to write a biography had a concrete model in mind upon which he proceeded to impose his own material.

The biographer usually begins with a brief preface to the

---

elle entre l'histoire et le panégyrique du saint. Mais il est reçu que la Vie s'attache davantage à l'exposé des faits, tandis que dans l'encomion on se tient beaucoup plus dans les généralités et que le côté parénétiqye y domine").

<sup>28</sup> The question of the originality of the *Vita Antonii* is discussed by Hans Mertel, *Die biographische Form der griechischen Heiligenlegenden* (Munich: C. Wolf und Sohn, 1909), p. 16f., who argues that the *Vita* is constructed on the "... typische Form des plutarchischen bios." The marrow of his argument is the startling comparisons he makes with the general scheme of ancient classical biography. Cf. Norton, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 26 (1925), p. 260, who applies this general scheme to the *Dialogus de Vita S. Chrysostomi* written by Palladius. See also Paul J. Alexander, "Secular biography at Byzantium," *Speculum*, XV (1940), p. 194, who refers to hagiography as a "progeny of classical biography." A successful criticism of Mertel's work is made by Karl Holl, "Die schriftstellerische Form des griechischen Heiligenlebens," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 29 (1912), p. 406f. The valid point made here is that these biographies are essentially different from the genre of antiquity inasmuch as their inner form, their aim, the events they illuminate are wholly foreign to the classic form.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. on this point E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), p. ix. See also Beck, p. 269. An outline of the *Vita Antonii* is found in Mertel's *Die biographische*, p. 12, where similar outlines of other *Lives* will be found. Another work which also served as model for the Byzantine biographer was the "biography-panegyric" (Oratio XLVIII) of St. Basil done by Gregory Nazianzus (P.G., Vol. 36, cols. 494-606). Many of its expressions were employed in the writings of the Lives and Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 361 f., informs us that the work was known by heart. On the influence of Gregory Nazianzus see Dvornik, *Les Legendes*, p. 33-34. Also A. Vogt and I. Hausherr, "Oraison Funèbre de Basile I par son Fils Léon VI le Sage," *Orientalia Christiana*, XXVI (1932), pp. 24-30.

general reader replete with stereotype and threadbare phrases. He declares his humility by saying he is unworthy and incompetent to undertake such a task. However, he feels the life of his hero must be retold so that it may become an example for future emulation.<sup>30</sup> This is to say, his chief purpose is pedagogic or as Delehayé would say "edifying" (a factor which governs the whole tenor of the document and is never lost sight of). The author next takes the opportunity to assure the reader that all he writes rests on authentic witnesses: his information is based on the testimony of those who knew the hero personally or it comes from the author himself, if he knew the hero directly.

This fact, however, does not always provide us with that *sine qua non* of historical analysis, a sound chronology. Often this is either absent or is given in vague terms. A good example is the *Life of St. John of Psicha*. We are not informed exactly when he was born or when he died. And there is a total confusion as to his exile (or exiles) under Leo V.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, the hagiographer is very fond of if not peculiarly prone to anachronism, of which the historian must perforce be wary.<sup>32</sup>

It is rare when the hagiographer identifies himself and gives his name. Such an example is the *Life of St. Nicetas of Medicium*. The author of this document was a certain monk Theosterictus. It contains both his name and refers to him as μαθητῆς αὐτοῦ.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> A virtuous life should not be hid from the many — ὡς λύχνου ὑπὸ τὸν μύδιον. The author of Nicetas' life further notes that ὁλίγα τῶν ἐκείνου κατορθωμάτων παρευθῆναι τῷ διηγήματι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἐν-τυγχανόντων. *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XIX.

<sup>31</sup> The editor is P. van den Ven, "La Vie grecque de S. Jean le Psi-chaité," *Le Muséon*, n.s. III (1902), pp. 97-125.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the notice on St. John, abbot of the monastery of Cathara, given in the *Synaxarium* for April 27, col. 633. Here we are told that in the reign of Leo V (813-820) John the Grammarian was Patriarch. This is next to impossible, since we know John only became Patriarch in 837 and was in fact during the period in question abbot of SS. Sergius and Bacchus monastery in Constantinople. The notice on St. John is presumably based on a now lost Life. Cf. Costa-Louillet, *Byzantion*, XXIV (1954), p. 241. On the dates of the iconoclast patriarchs, cf. the article by V. Grumel, whose findings are now the more acceptable, "Chronologie des patriarches iconoclastes du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Echos d'Orient*, XXXIV (1935), p. 166.

<sup>33</sup> ἐπατάριος εἰς τὸν ὄσιον πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογητὴν Νικήτην ὑπὸ Θεο-στυρίκτου μαθητοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαριωτάτου. *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XVIII.



It goes without saying that as a disciple of Nicetas, he was eminently suited for the task of biographer. Having known the saint personally, he was an eye-witness to the events he describes. Nicetas' *Life* was written before the restoration of the icons (843) and may therefore be considered a contemporary and to some degree polemic document. It abounds with detail on the first and second phase of iconoclasm. Indeed, the latter half of the work deals with the saint's involvement with the persecution under Leo V; here we are truly transported into the milieu of contemporary polemics. From this example, the historian can assume that any document containing the author's identity will probably be free of ponderous and tortured rhetoric and be distinguished by its historical merits.<sup>84</sup>

The circumstances of the saint's birth invariably follow. When the city of his birth is unknown the stereotype phrase is introduced: "was born in the city of the living God, in the heavenly Jerusalem." Often we read that the parents (until then sterile) consecrated their child to God, before birth. From the frequency of this testimony we would hazard the suggestion that the dedication to the monastery was a common practice among the Byzantines, its scriptural connotation notwithstanding. An extreme example of this was the family of St. John of Psicha, already referred to; it offers an interesting case since the entire family entered monasteries — father (already a priest), mother, two brothers (one of whom became a bishop), and his sister!<sup>85</sup>

The παιδεία of the child, which usually began at the age of

---

<sup>84</sup> The anonymous works have a propensity for more detail with the intention of further glorifying the subject. Delehaye, *The Legends*, p. 15, judiciously notes that biographers with literary pretensions are frequently more harmful to the saint. This is not the case, however, with the above mentioned text, which is unique neither in sophistication nor in the Greek employed. If, as Bréhier says, these biographies played a role comparable to that of the modern novel and the daily newspaper, then one can see the need for embellishment and exaggeration on the part of the hagiographer (*Journal des Savants*, XV [1917], p. 24).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. *Le Muséon*, n.s. III (1902), p. 106. St. Stephen was consecrated to God even before he was born. *Vita Stephano*, P.G., Vol. 100, col. 1077f. This was established usage as early as the Council of 692. Canon 40 of this Council decreed that no one under ten might become a monk. Mansi, XI, col. 961f. ἔσω τοίνυν ὁ μέλλων τὸν μοναχικὸν ὑπέρχεσθαι ζυγὸν οὐχ ἡττων ἢ δεκαετῆς.

seven, is next discussed.<sup>36</sup> The testimony rarely varies: the saint's preference for the services of the Church, reading the *Lives* and the Psalter,<sup>37</sup> his distaste for children's activities and secular education in general, all find their place in this section.<sup>38</sup> The correspondence to St. Antony's *Life* as a model is immediately apparent.

After a description of his arrival and profession in a monastic house the major portion of the *Life* is given up to a discussion of the saint's exercises in asceticism — his struggle with the devil and the flesh.<sup>39</sup> And it is exactly this protracted narrative that renders the *Life* so different from the classic scheme.<sup>40</sup> The saint here is not a character out of Plutarch but, as it were, out of a Christian *Weltanschauung*. In all *Lives* — "der inneren Entwicklung," as Holl says — the prevailing theme is the *ἄθλος* (athlos), not someone's virtues.<sup>41</sup> All things considered, this is its very *raison d'être*.<sup>42</sup> Here again, it is St. Antony's *Life* that has become the model for all would-be monks (ἱκανὸς χαρακτήρ is Athanasius'

<sup>36</sup> Dvornik, *Les Legendes*, p. 25f.

<sup>37</sup> By and large the Psalms and the Gospels appear to be the favorite books of the hagiographer and accordingly constitute the major source of his numerous quotations.

<sup>38</sup> Nicetas was always to be found in church, for example, *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XIX.

<sup>39</sup> The various parts of the *Life* are labelled thus by Norton, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 26 (1925), p. 260, *origo*, *infantia*, *species* (*mores virtutes*), *studia et opera*, *vita publica et privata*, *mors*, and finally *additamenta et supplementa* (usually eulogia). The scheme is not unlike the classic biography.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. above page 17, also Beck, p. 269f.

<sup>41</sup> "Die Hauptsache für den Verfasser eines Heiligenlebens ist und bleibt die Schilderung der inneren Entwicklung des Helden." *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 29 (1912), p. 426.

<sup>42</sup> The main object of Athanasius was to show that the gradual spiritual perfection of Antony was commensurate with his gradual withdrawal from the world. The farther he withdrew the greater the perfection. His whole ascetic struggle — his *ἄθλος* has precisely this purpose. Finally, we have the saint coming from the desert as *ἐκ τινος ἀδύτου μεμυσταγωγημένος καὶ θεοφορούμενος*; *Vita et Conversatio S. Antonii*, P.G., Vol. 26, col. 864. This is of course *ἀπάθεια* "the perfection elevated above all passions" — the goal of the Eastern monk. It is that which ever since Evagrius (and before him Origen) monastic Orthodox spirituality has been concerned with. Theosterictus is very aware of this theme of progress to perfection when he describes his hero's ultimate goal as *τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τῆς ἀπαθείας ἐφθάσεν*. *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XXII.

own description).<sup>43</sup>

It is in the nature of things to expect the same in the *Lives* of the iconoclastic era. Fundamentally the athlos is maintained; however, it is transformed into opposition and struggle against the government. The athlos in the desert or in the monastery recedes somewhat into the background. As Theosterictus, the author of *Nicetas' Life*, judiciously observes:

Some, thinking foolishly, consider this heresy as inferior on which account they are readily led astray and fall [into error]. Others, do not even suppose iconoclasm to be a heresy but a quarrel. Whereas I (and I expect everyone who thinks prudently), consider it a very terrible heresy since it conflicts with Christ's dispensation (οἰκονομία). Consider also this: other heresies saw their genesis from among bishops and lower clergy whereas iconoclasm originates with the government. And you know the difference between Priests and Emperors. For these heresies were organized because of dogmatic discussion and love of strife and only gradually increased in strength, but iconoclasm has its origin in royal authority [and therefore has the support the other heresies lacked].<sup>44</sup>

The significance of this passage is considerable and its meaning immediately apparent. In this quotation, a monk admits that for many, iconoclasm did not have the dogmatic import that other heresies had. However, the sympathies and opinions of the monastic world are shown to be elsewhere. Iconoclasm was for the monk a "terrible heresy" against which he was to wage his athlos, for the heresy constituted a denial of "Christ's economy." Theosterictus seems to be saying you can lose your soul just as easily by following the lead of the iconoclasts as you can by giving up the struggle with the devil in your cell. For this hagiographer (and undoubtedly for the reader) the dominant factor behind iconoclasm was the State. This is illuminating since it will be remembered that the declaration of war against the cult of images was an imperial decision. Moreover, it is debatable if the opposition could have attained the drive and dynamism it possessed in the eighth century had it not had imperial sanction and

<sup>43</sup> ἔστι γὰρ μοναχοῖς ἱκανὸς χαρακτήρ πρὸς ἀσκήσιν ὁ Ἀντωνίου βίος. *P.G.*, Vol. 26, col. 837.

<sup>44</sup> *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XXIII.

abetment. The author's remarks show considerable insight.

The death of the saint (often foreseen by him) is finally described. At this final scene the monks are usually gathered together and are often exhorted to observe the *regula* of the monastery. It is not unusual to have descriptions of miracles occurring at the saint's tomb. The *Life* concludes with a prayer for the Emperor and to the saint asking for blessing and protection.<sup>45</sup>

By no stretch of the imagination is the miraculous, which is so dear to Byzantine clergy and people, subdued in the *Lives*. This is equally true of works celebrated both for their literary and historical merit.<sup>46</sup> The miracles occur during the life of the saint or *post mortem* when they are often worked by his relics. These *genera miraculorum* frequently offer little diversity and indeed the majority seem to be variations of the New Testament.<sup>47</sup> Both the *Vita Nicephori*<sup>48</sup> and the *Vita Theophylacti Nicomediae*<sup>49</sup> are particular exceptions and fine illustrations of the historical reality of our documents, however. Neither of these texts contain a single miracle either before or after the death of the famous ecclesiastics.<sup>50</sup>

Yet the historian should perforce approach the miraculous with sympathy and readiness to understand, inasmuch as it was an intrinsic belief of the Byzantine historian, hagiographer, chronicler.<sup>51</sup> Miracles are basic to a Byzantine *Life* and the historian

<sup>45</sup> A fine and elaborate example of such a peroration is to be found in the *Vita Stephani Junioris*, P.G., Vol. 100, col. 1186.

<sup>46</sup> E.g. the *Life of Nicetas* which Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 464, considers relatively free of miracle. However, Nicetas is said to have had control over unclean spirits and healed a dumb boy; on two different occasions he healed two possessed monks; and three brothers at sea were saved by the saint's prayers. Finally, many healings occurred while the body of Nicetas was taken back to the monastery. When he was placed to rest "on the left of the narthex" of the monastery church, many marvels continued to occur. A.S. Aprilis, I, p. XXII, XXVII.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the miracle with the loaves of bread and wine by Peter of Atroa. *Le Muséon*, n.s. III (1902), p. 165.

<sup>48</sup> C. de Boor (ed.), *Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 139-217.

<sup>49</sup> Edited by A. Vogt in *Analecta Bollandiana*, L (1932), pp. 67-82.

<sup>50</sup> The *Vita Euthymii Sardensis* (= *Bodleianus Laudianus Graecus* 69) should also be included in this group since it too contains no miracles. I expect to publish this text in the near future.

<sup>51</sup> A salient example of the Byzantine historian is Nicephorus, who

should not wholly dismiss them. Admittedly, he will not believe the more outrageous supernatural achievements reported of the hero. For example, St. Peter of Atroa, we are told, had the charisma of invisibility and frequently employed it, especially when meeting iconoclast bishops on the road.<sup>52</sup> Yet the historian may regard a healing either by the saint himself or by his relics as possible.<sup>53</sup> Should he choose to exclude all the chroniclers and hagiographers of the iconoclastic period as historically unreliable because of their intense belief in miracle, we would have no documents left to us. This was part of the psychological make-up of the Byzantine. It is a unique means of understanding that complex phenomenon, the Byzantine soul.

In connection with this, a word should perhaps be added here about the religious bent of the Byzantines, of which these documents are a powerful reflection. The nature of Byzantine society, its recognizable character, its identity, which it maintained throughout the long millennium of its history, was decidedly religious. True, this is a generalization and a historian can only generalize at his peril. However, the most cursory student of Byzantium will not fail to recognize that the dominant taste of Byzantine society lay in theology. It is the Christian faith of Byzantium

---

in his *Breviarium* testifies that prior to the attack in images in 726 Leo III had been disturbed by volcanic eruptions in the Aegean. He had interpreted the natural phenomenon as a manifestation of God's anger toward images. C. de Boor (ed.), *Opuscula Historica*, p. 963. Cf. G. Ladner, "Origin and significance of the Byzantine iconoclastic controversy," *Medieval Studies*, II (1940), p. 141, who suggests Leo III may have also used the eruption to exploit the superstition of the people.

<sup>52</sup> *Le Muséon*, n.s. III (1902), p. 111.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the following remarks by two modern students of Byzantine hagiology, N. H. Baynes, "The supernatural defenders of Constantinople," in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London: University of London, 1956), p. 248, ("Modern writers on East Rome, convinced that 'miracles do not happen,' have quietly banished miracle from their histories and have thereby falsified the picture, for there can be no doubt that the Byzantine lived in a world where miracle could happen and did happen, and that belief in miracle is itself a fact of history which the student ignores at his peril.") Also Magoulias, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 57 (1964), p. 127, ("... we must accept the miraculous, accounts of magic, belief in demons, etc., as history — simply because the Byzantines did so — and the Byzantine historian, chronicler, and hagiographer were no exception to this rule. Miracles were an essential part of a saint's activity, and a saint's Life without miracles would be an impossibility.")

which unquestionably shaped its political institutions, its art, its literature, the totality of its life. It is this all-important and all-pervasive element that is faithfully mirrored in hagiography.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, and unless imagination carries one away, no other documents make one realize something of the place monasticism and the Church had in Byzantine life.

In addition, these documents provide us with a faithful, rich, and true picture of the world of the Byzantine monk and the lower strata of Byzantine society. The Byzantine historian and chronicler, more often than not, concentrates on events in Constantinople, wars, dynasties, or coup d'états at the expense of events in the provinces.<sup>55</sup> It is in this latter area that hagiography is appreciably rewarding. Hagiography is not afraid to speak of ordinary people, of the humble, of the man on the street, as it were. It is by way of hagiography that we penetrate into the otherwise obscure lives of the poor and gain a glimpse of their thought-worlds, their joys, their values, even their intellectual and doctrinal preoccupations. The "great mass of humanity"<sup>56</sup> so often neglected by the professional historian is rarely ignored by the hagiographer. Similarly, the *Lives* have a homely charm, a naive freshness, even an earthy originality (if we may be so bold), of which the rest of Byzantine literature is devoid.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Cf. François Halkin, "L'hagiographie Byzantine au service de l'histoire," in J.M. Hussey *et al.* (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 345 ("rien n'est plus révélateur d'une mentalité que le genre des livres dont on fait ses compagnons habituels.") Also Magoulas, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 57 (1964), p. 117 ("it is thanks to hagiography that we can best understand the psychological make-up and religious attitudes which motivated humanity in Byzantium.") The above picture of Byzantium does not exclude the contradictory mixture of "high qualities and startling vice." See C. Diehl, "Byzantine Civilization" in J. B. Bury (ed.), *The Cambridge Medieval History* (New York: The Macmillan Press, 1927), IV, 475-77.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. L. Bréhier, "Les populations rurales au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle d'après l'hagiographie byzantine," *Byzantion*, I (1924), p. 177f.

<sup>56</sup> The phrase is from Eileen Power's *Medieval People* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1964), p. 15.

<sup>57</sup> On the sterility of Byzantine literature cf. the wonderful remarks of N. H. Baynes, *Byzantine Studies*, p. 72 ("But this is no new phenomenon, the fruit of a supposed sterility amongst the Byzantines: they are but continuing the taste of the scholars of Alexandria; in Europe's Middle Ages they are the world's librarians.") Also G. Downey, "The Byzantine

## IV

A question that the researcher has to raise about these documents concerns the place of composition. Was the principal center of production the monastic scriptorium or the patriarchal chancery? If so how does this affect the documents. In light of the complex movement we are dealing with and the various parties involved — orthodox, heretics, moderates, extremists — the question is of the first magnitude. Inasmuch as these documents are contemporary in the main, it is not improbable that they were used as polemic and propaganda by the various groups. A number of these may be justifiably labelled religious pamphleteering — instruments for influencing "public opinion." In point of fact this is the particular importance of the celebrated study by Dobschütz, who initially discerned the propaganda this corpus embodies.<sup>58</sup>

A striking example of propaganda is the *Vita Nicephori* whose historical value is of no small moment.<sup>59</sup> This is a work of the patriarchal chancery (illustrating the importance of place of composition) and definitely written in the 840s to reflect the current efforts of the Byzantine patriarchate to magnify one of its Patriarchs. This systematic campaign under the leadership of Patriarch Methodius (843-47) was aimed, in the main, against the Studites, who had not been happy either with the election of the layman Nicephorus and his attitude toward the divorce of Constantine VI (the so-called Moechian affair), or with Methodius, saviour of orthodoxy. Here is religious pamphleteering at its best.<sup>60</sup>

One need not emphasize the fact therefore, that it is important

---

Church and the presentness of the past," *Theology Today*, 15 (1958), p. 93 ("the view of the custodial function (of Byzantine culture) has not always been understood. This was no static situation in which something created in the past was kept alive artificially . . .").

<sup>58</sup> *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVIII (1909), p. 41f.

<sup>59</sup> The *Vita* is to be found in C. de Boor's edition of the Patriarch's *Opuscula Historica*, pp. 139-217.

<sup>60</sup> A variant example, also containing elements of propaganda, is the *Life of Nicetas*. Theosterictus was certainly in Constantinople when he wrote, *ἔτι δὲ ὄντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, ἤρξατο ψιθυρίζεσθαι τὰ ἀσεβῆ καὶ θεοσυγῇ κατὰ τῶν σεβασμίων ἐκόντων δόγματα*. *A.S. Aprilis*, I, p. XXIII. However, there is a sort of footnote added at the end of the work which indicates that our present text was copied out in 916 by the monk John at Studios, then under abbot Anatolius. Dobschütz, *Byzantinische Zeit-*

to know the place of origin of these documents, for it does affect both the tenor and the content. C. Loparev, in his classic study, divided the documents into five centers of production: Constantinople, Asia Minor, the Syrian East, the Balkans, and Byzantine Italy. The majority of *Lives*, however, with which we are directly interested probably emanate from the monastic communities of two centers: Constantinople and Asia Minor. The two most important centers in Constantinople are of course the monastery of Studios and the patriarchal chancery. Studios, with its unrelenting position vis-à-vis the holy images, together with its impact on the movement in its second phase, was a natural place of production.<sup>61</sup> There were, to be sure, other hagiographical schools, such as the monastery of Chora which produced the *Vita Michaeli Syncelli* at the end of the ninth century.<sup>62</sup> It is regrettable, however, that we have no detailed information on any of these schools. All we can say is that they did exist; anything beyond this would be the purest conjecture.

It is not surprising that the city of Constantinople should be one of the major centers of hagiographical production. Yet, there were other centers which played cardinal roles in the history of the medieval East. One such center was in Bithynia. It is not exaggeration to say that the monasteries of Mt. Olympus in Bithynia played a role in the iconoclastic struggle commensurate with Studios of Constantinople. Once again, hagiography is the source which supports the above contention.

It is a fact that Mt. Olympus was the ἁγιον ὄρος for the Byzantines down to the eleventh century, when it began to be supplanted by Mt. Athos. Monasticism in Bithynia actually began in the first quarter of the fourth century.<sup>63</sup> The religious life attained great

---

*schrift*, 18 (1909), p. 83, states that we have a Studite adaptation of the original text. His chief argument is that Nicetas (because he received communion from the iconoclast Patriarch Theodotus) had been taken to task by the Studite Theodore. This is to say, the adaptation presents a Studite view (the initial text did not have such a view) and stresses the fact that Theodore did not approve of Nicetas' behavior.

<sup>61</sup> Constantinople was the principal center of production. Of the sixty biographies Loparev examined, twenty-seven at least belonged to the imperial city. Cf. *Journal des Savants*, XIV (1916), p. 450. These of course include documents which are not directly connected with iconoclasm.

<sup>62</sup> T. I. Schmit (ed.), *Izvestii Russkago Archeologiceskago Instituta v Konstantinople*, XI (1906), pp. 227-279.

<sup>63</sup> See the *A.S. Novembris*, II, p. 322-25, where the history of Olym-



proportions here, particularly in the eighth and ninth centuries, so much so that on this point it invites comparison with Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and later Athos.<sup>64</sup> The crisis over the images undoubtedly had a decisive effect both on the evolution and growth of Bithynian monasticism.

Not all the monasteries were on Mt. Olympus. Quite a few of them — we know the names of twelve — were to be found in the valleys or on the high plateau.<sup>65</sup> One of the most celebrated of these monasteries was Saccoudion — representative both of the monastic houses of Byzantium in the late eighth century and of the Studite reform. For Saccoudion, in the heart of Bithynia, was the springboard of the Studite movement, since it was here that Theodore began his life as a monk under the guidance of his uncle, Plato.<sup>66</sup> There is a charming description of this famous house in the *Vita Theodori Studitae* by the monk Michael.<sup>67</sup> It is the monasteries of Bithynia that gave Byzantium a number of illustrious saints and iconodules — even martyrs, who waged their Athlos against the iconoclasm of several Emperors. Later these houses chose to perpetuate the memory of these individuals by writing their biographies.

---

pus is traced down to the thirteenth century, when the monks were forced to leave with the inundation of Asia Minor by the Turks. This marks the end of monasticism on Olympus. The Turks called the mountain "Ket-chich dag," the mountain of monks. The first hermit is said to have been Neophytus, who arrived during the reign of Diocletian.

<sup>64</sup> See the article "Bithynie" by R. Janin in A. Meyer (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclesiastiques* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1937), IX, cols. 20-28. On the topography (with maps) see W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1890), pp. 179-197. Cf. also B. Menthon, *L'Olympe le Bithynie, ses Saints, ses Convents, ses Sites* (Paris: Bonne Presse, 1935), p. 1, who refers to Olympus as "une véritable Thébàïde."

<sup>65</sup> The *A.S. Novembris*, II, p. 323, gives a list of these communities.

<sup>66</sup> St. Plato as a youth became a member of the community of Sym-bolon on Olympus and subsequently its abbot, succeeding Theoctistus. It is not until the reign of Irene and by her order that he took charge of Saccoudion. Cf. *Vita Platonis*, *P.G.*, Vol. 99, col. 804f. See L. Bréhier, *Les Institutions de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1949), p. 540f. for Saccoudion and the Studite reform.

<sup>67</sup> *P.G.*, Vol. 99, col. 241. Obviously, for the Studite as well as for St. Basil in the fourth century, the *sine qua non* of withdrawal was a peaceful house, a refuge from the noise of the world. Cf. Basil's letter to Gregory Nazianzus in R. Deferrari (trans.), *Saint Basil, the Letters* (New York: Loeb Classical Library, 1926), I, 7f.

## V

In brief recapitulation, it should be noted that many of these *Lives* are in truth ponderous and repetitious — the orchestration anew of the same theme. Almost always it is the story of a monk, abbot, or patriarch struggling against the iconoclast government and being in turn tortured, imprisoned, exiled, or condemned to certain death. All the same, as the foregoing shows, these documents contain substantially more than a repetitious motif and as historical sources are by no means negligible.

The hagiographical dossier of the iconoclastic era — a formative influence in determining Byzantine piety — is both historically trustworthy and pregnant with information which we look for in vain in other documents. These documents are not devoid *a priori* of historical reality. They are not merely a tissue of folktales or of miracles, this being ostensibly the only *forte* of the hagiographer. It is true the Byzantines loved a good story and delighted in miracles, and it should not astonish us that these *Lives* were very popular reading in Byzantium. (Judging from their numbers not a few must have made the best-seller list.)<sup>68</sup> Yet it must be emphasized that they are not just a body of legends as Lombard believes, unable to offer us any real image of Byzantium.<sup>69</sup>

One of the basic features of hagiography is its lack of judgment. But then the hagiographer was never self-consciously a critical historian. He wrote to illustrate God's grace working in pious men; he did not write for posterity. This feature in hagiography is not a hindrance if allowances are made and the documents are approached scientifically and with a willingness to comprehend. It is only by way of this approach that hagiography — in its own homely way — can bring the historian a step closer to an understanding of that intensely theological age, iconoclasm. Hagiography, far from solving all the questions of this absorbing chapter of Byzantine history, does illuminate its complexity by lifting the darkness and confusion of the age somewhat.

DUMBARTON OAKS  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>68</sup> Halkin, *Proceedings*, p. 345 ("durant les dix ou douze siècles que dura l'Empire byzantin, il n'y eut pas de littérature plus demandée, plus appréciée dans toutes les couches de la société, chez laïcs comme dans les monastères, que l'hagiographie.")

<sup>69</sup> *Constantin*, p. 8.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

organic theoretical and practical relationship with every other motif. Or is this liable to provide us simply with another motif?

STANLEY HARAKAS  
Hellenic College

ISTITUTO PER LE SCIENZE RELIGIOSE DI BOLOGNA, *Testi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose, Indices Verborum et Locutionum Decretorum Concilii Vaticani II*, n° 3, *Constitutio Dogmatica de Ecclesia, Lumen Gentium*. Florence: Vallecchi Editore, 1968. Pp. xi and 224. \$6.00. And ——— *idem*, n° 5, *Decretum de Oecumenismo, Unitatis Redintegratio*. Florence: Vallecchi Editore, 1968. Pp. x and 83. \$2.90.

These two volumes of *Indices* on the conciliary texts of Vatican II, prepared by the Institute of Religious Sciences in Bologna, Italy, represent a scholarly work which can be helpful to both churchmen and scholars.

The Director of the Institute, Dr. Joseph Alberigo, Professor of the University of Bologna, gives a short preface to each volume, followed by the official texts of the conciliary documents, and an exhaustive inventory of the words and expressions used in these texts. Finally, tables of the scriptural, patristic, and other quotations complete the work.

In the preface (in Latin, pp. vii-ix) of the volume on the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium*, Prof. Alberigo refers to the work of the Institute preceding Vatican II, a volume of about eight hundred pages containing the decrees of the "previous ecumenical councils." This volume was published by the Institute as a contribution to the preparation of the Second Vatican Council. The *Indices*, the most recent work of the Institute, are intended to be contributions for a better understanding of the conciliary texts, and, consequently, for a better use of the decrees of the Council in the effort of renewal of the Roman Catholic Church. The purpose of the Institute is to offer "an inventory as analytical and as objective as possible of the texts of the Council, giving a knowledge of the order and composition of each of the conciliary decrees, and, at the same time, making their comparison both accurate and convenient" (p. viii).

The previous systematic inventories, being incomplete, made imperative this edition of the Institute. Those inventories during the interim are easy to consult. However, they do present the danger of omitting many useful elements, and especially the danger of a variety of opinions and arbitrariness. An exception is the "*Index Verborum*" by X. Ochoa (Rome, 1967). This *Index* is very accurate and useful, but has the inconvenience of giving a short context to the words used. Thus, it is necessary to refer to the conciliary texts in order to get the full meaning of the words. Compared to this one-volume *Index*, the *Indices* of the Institute give an ample context of the single words. This makes the sentence fully understandable, without having to consult the text. The author of the Preface is most justified in saying, "There are two advantages to this: first, a rapid inventory of similar locutions can be made, and second, a summary of a

doctrine is already offered by the number of references under the same title" (p. ix).

Concerning the choice of the words, Prof. Alberigo affirms that the emphasis is given by the Institute to the *doctrine* and *not* to the *language*. For this reason the substantives, verbs, and qualitative adjectives are without exception included in the inventory. Words without significance for the establishment of a doctrine are generally omitted (*ibid.* and p. x).

In the preparation of the textual sections there was the inevitable selection to make: that of determining the words which give the principal meaning to a sentence. "Any ambiguity or alteration of the meaning of the text has been avoided" (p. xi).

The preface is followed by the text of the Council (pp. 1-54), the inventory (pp. 58-229), and the tables (233-244). The inventory and the tables are the work of all the scholars doing research at the Institute, supervised and directed to completion by Dr. Franca Magistretti.

What is peculiar to this edition of the text is that the famous *Nota praevia* (preliminary note) to the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, which comes directly from the *Acts* of the Council and does not appear in the official publication of the conciliary texts, is edited here at the end of the official text (pp. 55-56).

As for the second volume, on the *Decree on Ecumenism*, the same introduction by Prof. Alberigo (second part, pp. vii-x) precedes the edition of the official text (pp. 1-15). The same patterns used for the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* are used here also in the inventory (pp. 17-78) and the tables of quotations (pp. 79-83).

We deeply appreciate this valuable work of the Institute of Bologna. It gives skillfully prepared, well introduced, and extensively documented inventories on the single documents of the Second Vatican Council. For all those who are, in one way or another, concerned with the work and doctrine of Vatican II, these inventories are of great importance for the proper comprehension and the organization of materials in its texts. The various tables at the end give us an image of the quantity and quality of biblical, patristic, and other quotations used by the Council, permitting a rapid and facile evaluation of its work. We hope to see the series of inventories completed soon. We cannot but thank Prof. Alberigo for having taken the initiative for such a useful and praiseworthy enterprise.

MAXIMOS AGHIORGOUSSIS  
Hellenic College

GEORGE ELDON LADD, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968. Pp. 119. \$3.75.

This book by the well-known Evangelical scholar proposes to demonstrate that a basic unity or "pattern" underlies the Synoptics, John and Paul. According to the author, these main strata of the New Testament have in common (1) the same view of God, man, and the world, (2) the Hebraic background, (3) ethical dualism, and (4) an understanding of

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# THE LIFE OF ST. PHILARETOS (702-792) AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR BYZANTINE AGRICULTURE

By JOHN W. NESBITT

## INTRODUCTION

### *Object of the work.*

An agrarian history of Byzantium has yet to be written. Perhaps, not in the too distant future, such a history will appear. For there exists at present an extensive body of literature on "agrarian conditions" at Byzantium — although little attention has been paid so far to agriculture itself.<sup>1</sup> The foregoing qualification refers to the fact that investigation has concentrated almost exclusively on the farmer in his institutional roles: as proprietor, lessor, tenant, soldier and taxpayer. We lack a clear picture of the Byzantine farmer in his primary role, that of producer of agricultural commodities. An understanding of the land, its use, its manner of exploitation, its potentialities and limitations is fundamental to an agrarian history of Byzantium. It is the basis for any realistic and meaningful assessment of such important problems as government land policy, land taxation and land aggrandizement. Due to the necessity of limiting the scope of this paper, our particular concern will be with land aggrandizement. Through a discussion of its manifestations against the broader background of Byzantine agriculture, we hope to make the concept of "land hunger" during the Middle Byzantine Era better understood.

### *Sources.*

Considering the number and type of sources at our disposal, it is not possible to derive a detailed notion about the practice of agriculture at Byzantium. The principal obstacle to our understanding of agricultural production is a lacuna in Byzantine literature. It did not produce a work on agronomy in the tradition of Cato and Columella. Lacking such a direct and explicit source,

---

<sup>1</sup> The reader will find a current bibliographical listing of Byzantine agrarian literature in the *Cambridge Economic History*, I, revised edition 1966, pp. 774-779.

social historians have been absorbed in the institutional side of agrarian life, in as much as the principal sources for agrarian history are institutional and legal. Because these sources admit to few details concerning the practice of agriculture, our account of agricultural production must be sketchy. Nevertheless, our sources do permit us to touch upon the main points. Of utmost importance is the Byzantine Peasants' Law.<sup>2</sup> According to Ostrogorsky, whose opinion is now in the ascendant, this rural code was drawn up under Justinian II (685-695). We possess two other sources of signal value in regard both to agriculture and to land aggrandizement. One source is a fiscal treatise; the other is a saint's life. The date of composition of the fiscal treatise is unknown.<sup>3</sup> Dölger would place the date of its composition in the eleventh century, whereas Ostrogorsky would assign the mid-tenth century. Hagiography provides one source of prime significance. This is the Life of St. Philaretos the Merciful.<sup>4</sup> Philaretos was born in 702 and died in 792. In 822 his grandson, the monk Nicetas, while he was in exile at Karioupolis, set down an account of his grandfather's exemplary career. The Life is a retelling of the biblical Job story within a Medieval Byzantine setting. It details the tribulations and charitable acts of a large land-owner who lived at Amnia, near Gangres, in Paphlagonia. The Life is a unique mine of information. Although the Iconoclast Controversy occasioned the writing of many saints' lives, the lives of this period, despite the rural setting of most, offer few details about Byzantine agriculture or rural affairs. They deal principally with a saint's involvement in the iconoclast persecutions and with his personal piety. In marked contrast, St. Philaretos, as a lay provincial *δυνατός*, was an individual whose activities were inextricably linked with the land.

---

<sup>2</sup> The text of the Byzantine Peasants' Law, together with an English translation, will be found in W. Ashburner, "The Farmers' Law," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 30 (1910), pp. 85-108; *ibid.*, 32 (1912), pp. 68-95.

<sup>3</sup> Text established by W. Ashburner, "A Byzantine Treatise of Taxation," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35 (1915), pp. 76-85; a German translation has been appended to an article by Ostrogorsky in *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 20 (1927), pp. 91-103.

<sup>4</sup> See M. H. Fourny and M. Leroy, "La Vie de Philarète," *Byzantion* 9 (1934), pp. 85-170. Prior edition by A. Vasiliev from single ms. (Parisinus 1510) in *Izvestija russkago arheologiceskago Instituta* 5 (1900), pp. 64-86.



## I

The *Life* of St. Philaretos provides an excellent study in land aggrandizement. Previously, however, this aspect of the *Life* has not been appreciated. This situation may be the result of some unfortunate remarks by Louis Bréhier about the early background of the saint. The opening sentence of the *Life*, the passage in dispute, is worth quoting in full.

There was a man in the land of the Paphlagonians by the name of Philaretos and this man, who was the son of George the Well-Named, was a noble among the people of Pontus and Galatia.

Commenting on this sentence in an article concerning rural society — an article which is well known and frequently cited — Bréhier observes correctly that the name of the father (Γεώργιος ὁ Φερώ-νυμος) betrays Philaretos' low origins. He was the son of a laborer. Philaretos' claim, therefore, to the appellation "noble" (εὐγενής) was of late date. Nicetas badly states the basis of Philaretos' right to this title. In the next sentence Nicetas states: "He [Philaretos] was very rich." This passage is an excellent example of the equation between nobility and wealth in the provinces. But Bréhier is not correct when he declares that Philaretos was originally from Lesser Armenia, interpreting the text to mean that Philaretos, a noble of Lesser Armenia, had emigrated to Paphlagonia.<sup>5</sup> Surely Bréhier is in error. For Nicetas states that after the loss of his wealth the only property and dwelling which Philaretos had left was the property and home which his father had bequeathed him.<sup>6</sup> The πατρῷος οἶκος was at Amnia. This fact permits only one conclusion. Philaretos was a native of Paphlagonia. In the opening sentence of the *Life*, Nicetas is ambiguous about Philaretos' origins. The connection between Paphlagonia and Pontus and Galatia is not well established. Nevertheless, we should view this ambiguity as a question of design, rather than one of poor writing ability. Nicetas has chosen to intimate, in preference to stating directly, that there were two phases in Phi-

---

<sup>5</sup> "Originaire de la Petite-Arménie": so Louis Bréhier in his article "Les populations rurales au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle d'après l'hagiographie byzantine," *Byzantion* 1 (1924), p. 180. Oddly, M. H. Fourmy and M. Leroy do not comment on Philaretos' origins.

<sup>6</sup> M. H. Fourmy and M. Leroy, "La Vie de Philarète," p. 117.

laretos' early life. Nicetas intimates, first of all, that when Philaretos was born, he was not a noble by birth. Nicetas gets this inference across by simply calling Philaretos an inhabitant of Paphlagonia. The inference is reinforced by the insertion of the name of Philaretos' father, George the Well-Named. Nicetas does not call George the Well-Named a noble because it was Philaretos who established the family's fortunes. Nicetas intimates this second phase, the rise to the state of nobility, by then calling Philaretos a noble of Pontus and Galatia. To recapitulate, Philaretos was born of low status at Amnia in Paphlagonia. He rose to a place of prominence within the provincial social structure as the direct result of an increase in wealth. We have noted already the equation by Nicetas of nobility and wealth. What kind of wealth did Nicetas possess? It was landed wealth. Nicetas informs us that Philaretos owned 48 large estates (προάστια πολλῆς γῆς πεπληρωμένα — we should note here that the term προάστια by this date no longer simply means "suburbs" but has acquired the additional meaning of "large estates" or "domains").

The number of estates which Philaretos owned is perhaps not so extraordinary. But what is extraordinary is this. If Philaretos was recognized as a noble in Pontus and Galatia, and undoubtedly after a certain time in Paphlagonia as well, then we must conclude that Philaretos was recognized a noble in these three areas because he owned estates in each of these three areas. Nicetas has equated Philaretos' nobility with his wealth, specifically landed wealth. The acquisition of estates was Philaretos' avenue to the title of noble. There can be no mistake in interpreting Nicetas' inferences with regard to Philaretos' career. Beginning with the acquisition of land in Paphlagonia, and becoming recognized as a noble there, Philaretos proceeded to acquire land in Pontus and Galatia and became recognized as a noble in these two areas, as well as in Paphlagonia. To repeat, the number of estates which Philaretos owned is not so extraordinary. What is extraordinary is the extreme fragmentation of his holdings. Rather than owning a consolidated holding, which would have been more profitable, if only from the viewpoint of proper management, Philaretos owned 48 separate estates — προάστια . . . μονώτατα πάντα. Moreover, he owned these 48 separate estates, not in one region, Paphlagonia, but in three different regions — Paphlagonia, Pontus and Galatia. Why such an extreme fragmentation of his holdings?

## II

It is important that we understand why Philaretos' holdings present a picture of such extreme fragmentation. For in the answer to this one question lies the answer to a number of fundamental questions about the nature of Byzantine land hunger. Through a comparison of the evidence in which land aggrandizement manifests itself, as revealed respectively in the Rural Code (seventh century), the Life of St. Philaretos (eighth century) and the treatise on taxation (tenth century), we shall best be enabled to detect the forces which led to the crisis of the tenth century in land aggrandizement.

The Rural Code shows that there were no innovations by the Byzantines in agricultural equipment or techniques.<sup>7</sup> Successful agriculture at Byzantium depended on hard work. Most areas of Greece and Asia Minor have a Mediterranean climate. The principal characteristic of this climate is dry summers and more or less humid winters. Consequently winter cereals, grapes, olives and figs are the principal rain-fed crops.<sup>8</sup> For the same reasons that these crops are grown today, the fact that they are winter resistant and can be grown in many areas without irrigation, these were the principal crops at Byzantium. Among the winter cereals, wheat and barley predominated. The main problem of the Byzantine farmer was to conserve water within the soil. Water had to be conserved against a short-fall in rain during winter and against transpiration and evaporation in the summer.<sup>9</sup> In addition to conserving water within the soil, the farmer also had the problem of ensuring good drainage. Good drainage was essential for cereal production as well as for viticulture. The tools of the farmer, as revealed in the Rural Code, reflect this two-fold struggle. In this struggle, the aratrum was an essential weapon. Professor Teall has well pointed out that the northern overturn plow, which was so valuable in opening up the Danubian basin to agriculture, was of no value in this climate. Such a plow would have permitted evaporation during the summer months. Byzantium was the land

---

<sup>7</sup> See the excellent remarks by John L. Teall, "The Grain Supply of the Byzantine Empire," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959), pp. 128-129.

<sup>8</sup> See J. Papadakas, *Climates of the World and Their Agricultural Potentialities* (Buenos Aires, 1966), p. 75.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. C. E. Stevens in the *Cambridge Economic History*, I, revised edition 1966, pp. 96-97.

of the sliding plow. Its main function was to remove weeds. For weeds were an unwonted competitor for moisture within the soil. Apart from the scythe, all the other tools mentioned in the Rural Code are connected with weeding and drainage. Article 22 mentions the spade, the hoe and the pruning knife. The function of the *δίκελλα*, the hoe, was to break up soil and clear weeds within the vineyard.<sup>10</sup> As Article 12 states with regard to the vineyard, one must "dig it and fence it and dig it over." The spade was used to dig the ditches which are mentioned in the Rural Code in connection with vineyards. These ditches were probably dug both to demarcate a property line and to ensure good drainage. The point about tools is this. Just to ensure a crop, the farmer had to toil diligently. But there were no innovations in implements which permitted him to increase his yields significantly. What about techniques? The techniques which the Byzantine farmer knew in order to increase the productivity of his land were the same as those in ancient times. He might rest the land and allow it to remain fallow for a year or he might manure it heavily. Both techniques would have been an aid in replenishing the fertility of the soil, but neither technique could have raised productivity significantly. The only way that the farmer could have raised productivity by an appreciable degree would have been to increase the number or size of his holdings. Climate and soil conditions, together with a lack of innovation, combined to exert a constant pressure for the farmer to expand his holdings.

It was only natural that the farmer should seek to expand his arable or pasture land, which might be in danger of over-grazing, within the commune. Such land would have been already under cultivation and, moreover, would have permitted the farmer to maintain to some degree a consolidated holding. But the treatise on taxation shows that at least by 900, and most likely considerably earlier, the point had been passed where a farmer could expand his arable or pasture land and still maintain a consolidated holding within the commune. Commenting on the origins of farmsteads outside the commune, the author of the tax treatise states that a farmer, at death, might leave behind many children. Some of the lands might lie within the commune, other lands outside the commune. In this instance, a portion of his children

---

<sup>10</sup> Concerning the *dikella*, see K. D. White, *Agricultural Implements of the Roman World* (Cambridge, 1967), pp.49-50.

would inherit land within the commune; the rest would inherit land outside the commune. In the latter case, these children, finding it impossible to live within the commune and work land outside it, left the commune and built farmsteads on their land outside the commune.<sup>11</sup> What is of interest here is the inheritance which the father bequeathed. He did not leave a consolidated holding, but a fragmented holding. Part of the land was outside the commune; part of the land was inside the commune. The point had been reached long ago when it was no longer possible to own a consolidated holding.

The fragmentation of holdings which we note in the treatise on taxation is a reflection that the land was filling up rapidly by 900. Professor Teall is undoubtedly correct when he asserts that this process got underway after 800 when conditions within the Empire became more settled.<sup>12</sup> After 800, then, population pressure is a factor in explaining fragmentation of holdings. But it does not appear to be a factor in explaining the fragmentation of holdings which we have seen already in the Life of St. Philaretos. The reason lies elsewhere.

Nicetas states that Philaretos "was very rich and possessed many flocks and herds." He then proceeds to list the numbers of these flocks and herds: 600 head of cattle; 100 yoked pairs of oxen; 800 horses in pasturage; 80 mules and saddle horses; and 12,000 head of sheep. The fact that Philaretos vigorously engaged in expanding his holdings and increasing the numbers of his flocks and herds indicates that there was an unfulfilled demand in the market for agricultural commodities. Money was to be made in supplying this unfulfilled demand with horses, hides, mutton, cheese and wool. Does this gap between supply and demand reflect then, an absolute rise in population prior to 800? Probably not. What it would seem to reflect is the adverse effect of the Arab *razzia* on agricultural production. We tend too often to think of Arab "booty" in terms of expensive textiles or metallic objects of gold or silver. But livestock was also a most desirable item. This is well brought out in the Life of St. Philaretos. Nicetas states that his grandfather lost all his flocks and herds by

---

<sup>11</sup> W. Ashburner, "A Byzantine Treatise on Taxation," p. 77.

<sup>12</sup> A fine summary on this point, John L. Teall, "The Grain Supply of the Byzantine Empire," pp. 131-132.

charitable acts<sup>13</sup> and through seizures (διὰ αἰχμαλωσίας) of the Arabs.<sup>14</sup> In terms of booty, cattle, sheep, horses and mules were both costly items and eminently utilitarian. This passage from the Life of St. Philaretos throws much light on the disruptive effects of Arab attacks on agricultural production.

After enumerating the numbers of Philaretos' flocks and herds, Nicetas goes on to say the following: "He [Philaretos] had 48 large estates; all, which were separated, were very fruitful and of great value. For, facing each of these large estates was a stream which gushed forth from on high. . . ." Before commenting on this passage, let us consider the geography, climate, soils and agricultural potential of the area where Philaretos had his estates.<sup>15</sup> To the north of Amnia lies the uninviting Northern Forest Region of the Pontic Ranges. There are few stretches suitable for agriculture. It is understandable that Philaretos should have sought to expand his estates, not to the north in Paphlagonia, but to the south in the Western and Eastern Plateaus. The agricultural potential of the region consists mainly of cereal production and livestock raising. The potentials of the region are reflected in Philaretos' Life. Philaretos owned large flocks and herds. To some degree Philaretos engaged in cereal production. He owned 100 pair of yoked oxen. The limitations of the land are also reflected in the Life. The region of the Western and Eastern Plateau is marked by low rainfall and is subject to periodic drought. Consequently, land beside a stream or lake is highly prized. Nicetas states that Philaretos' lands were of great value. "For, facing each of these large estates was a stream which gushed forth from on high. . . ."

Water was the reason why Philaretos' holdings were so fragmented. In the process of acquiring new estates, Philaretos' chief concern was not over the proximity between estates, but the availability of water which each new estate offered.

Thus, even before 800 and the upturn in population, there was keen competition for land. But it was not for land as such,

---

<sup>13</sup> For Philaretos' philanthropic activity see Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, Rutgers Byzantine Series (New Brunswick, N.J., 1968), pp. 97-99.

<sup>14</sup> M. H. Fourmy and M. Leroy, "La Vie de Philarète," p. 115.

<sup>15</sup> For consideration of geography, climate, etc., see L. Dudley Stamp, *Asia* (London, eleventh edition 1962), pp. 73-107.

but for more fertile and well-watered land. Before 800, large land owners, such as Philaretos, scoured their respective regions in search of sites suitable for large scale agricultural enterprises. Consequently, we must not see a keen competition for land as a phenomenon beginning after 800. Such keen competition, due to the agricultural limitations of the land, was already markedly present in the eighth century. When population was added as a factor in the ninth century, it was then that a crisis of land hunger resulted in the tenth century in which the arable and pasturage land of the commune was held in the balance.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
MADISON

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.



guage. Although, as the translators correctly note, it is not a simple matter of substituting one translation for another (because of the use of the Septuagint by the Orthodox Church), this reviewer earnestly hopes that they will reconsider the question of language for their subsequent labors.

As it stands, the *Festal Menaion* is an excellent contribution to religious literature in English. For Orthodox Christians it fills an important need. It is a volume that should be read and studied by all English speaking Christians and should be used in all Orthodox churches where English is employed.

N. M. VAPORIS

*Hellenic College*

JOHN CHR. CONSTANTINIDES, *Νικόλαος Α' ὁ Μυστικός (ca 852-925 μ.Χ.) Πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (901-907, 912-925). Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ α' τετάρτου τοῦ Ι' μ.Χ. αἰῶνος*. Athens, 1967. Pp. 221.

Byzantine scholarship has been waiting for some time now for a study on the great early tenth century Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticos. This has been fulfilled to an extent in Modern Greek by Dr. John Constantinides, in his doctoral dissertation for the Theological School of the University of Athens. Although the book can only be characterized as an introduction, it deserves to be examined for being the first comprehensive scientific study on the Patriarch.

The work in question is divided into two parts. The first deals with Mysticos as an ecclesiastical and political personality, while the second examines him as a writer and theologian.

The author follows a strict chronological order in his examination of the life and activities of Nicholas in the first chapter. He examines in turn Nicholas's first term in office (901-07) and his involvement in the problem of Leo VI's fourth marriage, his exile and the accession of Euthymios as Patriarch, his return to office in 912 and his activities during the turbulent years 912-919, and it ends with his career in the course of Romanos Lecapenos' reign until his death in 925. Unfortunately, the narrative is generally speaking brief and restricted, making it quite impossible to explore from all angles the Patriarch's activities in the political scene, during this complicated period of Byzantine history.

The following chapter is devoted to Nicholas' missionary activities among the Alans of Caucasus and the Chazars, and to his relations with the Armenians. It was his ardent wish to win all the Armenians to the faith of Chalcedon and hopefully to the complete Byzantine sphere of influence, but to no avail. The first part closes with a chapter concerning the relations between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople during this period. It examines to a greater detail the problem of the fourth marriage and the ensuing schism, the correspondence of Mysticos with his counterparts in Rome, and the restoration of relations in 923.

Dr. Constantinides cites the various agreeable and disagreeable sources

in describing the problems facing him, but the attempt to elucidate the questionable areas is very minute. We may mention here the notorious ill-treatment and abuse suffered by the ex-Patriarch Euthymios in the hands of the Nicholaite party. This is recorded well by the author (pp. 58-64), but no attempt is made to clear the question of Mysticos' personal responsibility and involvement. The same question may be posed as to his possible complication in the revolt of Constantine Ducas in 913, and perhaps in the elevation of Romanos Lecapenos. These are questions of the greatest importance for our understanding of the man and their evaluation would aid us greatly. By the same token, the author does not elucidate the canonical reasons, if any, for the Pope's allowance of the fourth marriage, which is termed by Nicholas as licentiousness and fornication (p. 164). In addition, he fails to expound the apparent "about face" of Mysticos concerning the fourth marriage, as indicated by the letters of his contemporary Arethas, the noted humanist Archbishop of Caesarea. One might add that the powers of emperor and patriarch alike as stated in the *Epanagoge*, and their probable relation to the controversy is observed nowhere, and perhaps another interesting but absent factor is the evaluation of the Patriarch's general statesmanship.

The second part is devoted to the theological ideas of Nicholas Mysticos, with the exception of a small section dealing with his writings. These include about two hundred letters, homilies, canonical constitutions and some other works of doubtful origin. We are informed of their general nature, their manuscript location and the facts concerning their edition and publication. This is indeed a good and concise informative chapter.

As to the theology of Nicholas, Dr. Constantinides examines his ideas concerning God, Demonology, Christology, the Mysteries and Ecclesiology, as well as his moral teaching. Mysticos seems to be neither a systematic nor an original theologian, although the air of the author's narrative might give one a different impression. He follows the already established tradition set forth by the earlier Fathers. A point of interest is his close association of the act of dispensation (*oiconomia*) and repentance. He is against the harsh forms of penance meted out to the sinner, preferring to use "*oiconomia*" as a helping hand for his salvation (p. 163). This might be a hint concerning his apparent original position on the question of Leo's fourth marriage, but the author again remains silent.

His theory concerning kingship is typically Byzantine. The Patriarch believes in its divine origin, but also in the subjection of the king to the laws of the state (p. 176 ff.). The book ends with the author's concluding remarks, which are favorable to his subject, but prior to these he lists the various opinions of Byzantine scholars regarding Mysticos.

In general, the book could be of great value to the general reader, but to the student of Byzantine studies it can only be an introduction to the life of a most interesting tenth century figure. It contains a list of abbreviations, a most useful bibliography of the sources and secondary works, tables of Nicholas' Letters as found in Mai and Migne and their corresponding position in the *Regestes* of Grumel and vice versa, an index and a very brief section of *addenda et corrigenda*.

Being that it is the first serious attempt to elucidate Nicholas Mysticos' place in history, the book should be considered of value, although its shortcomings are several and significant. Unless these are dealt in detail, Nicholas Mysticos will remain an incomplete chapter in the field of Byzantine scholarship.

NICHOLAS G. ITSINES  
*Staten Island, New York*

EDWARD P. ECHLIN, S.J., *The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective: Doctrine and Rite from Cranmer to Seabury*. New York: Seabury Press, 1968. Pp. 305. \$7.50.

This carefully documented and scholarly book with an ecumenical perspective, comes from the hands of a Roman Catholic for the sake of unity hopefully to come between his Church and the flock of Canterbury. Father Echlin, a Jesuit priest and professor at John Carroll University, Cleveland, since 1964, rather convincingly demonstrates the historical development of Anglican Eucharistic thought within the past two hundred forty years as coming closer to Rome, while at the same time the Roman Eucharistic thought as tending "to converge with the insights of Anglicanism."

In six chapters, nine forms of the Anglican Communion Services are examined with a concentration on the doctrines of Sacrifice and Real Presence from the period of Archbishop Cranmer (1549) and the dramatic revisions that followed in the years 1559, 1604, 1637, 1662, 1718, 1764, to the "Episcopal Mass" that was framed at Philadelphia under the powerful argumentation and persuasion of Bishop Samuel Seabury and his associates. The first American Bishop of his Church, having received Episcopal ordination from the Non-Juror Bishops of Scotland set out in that historical conference to have his ordination and the Scottish Canon with its emphasis on Sacrifice and Real Presence be accepted, and succeeded in both endeavors. Thus the long Eucharistic development that had begun in England at Thomas Cranmer's desk in the time of Reformation reached a consummation in the New World, in which time it moved closer to the Roman Mass, so close in fact, believes the author, that both became "identical" in essence. This conclusion is shared by the Joint Commission of Anglicans and Roman Catholics meeting at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 24-26, 1967, to discuss the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. In a joint statement the Commission stated that "since the time of the Reformation, the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice has been considered a major obstacle to the reconciliation of the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. It is the conviction of our commission that this is no longer true."

After establishing the substantial "identity" in the area of Eucharistic doctrine, the author proceeds in his concluding remarks to offer certain practical implications in the form of proposals. These are: first, that Anglican and Roman Catholic priests should concelebrate "when it is authorised by both Churches" in order to satisfy everyone that there is a "valid" Mass; secondly, that if the Mass takes place in a Roman Church, the Anglican Service be used and conversely, if in an Anglican that the

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

## BOOK REVIEWS

JOSÉ GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode, Hymnes*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1964-67. 4 vols. (Sources Chrétiennes, Nos. 99, 110, 114, 128.)

Students of Greek poetry and historians of Byzantium and Eastern Orthodox Christianity have good reason to welcome these four volumes of the hymns of St. Romanos the Melodos, which have been published by the French scholar José Grosdidier de Matons. Thanks to his work as well as to that of other scholars in several countries, the golden halo of the Byzantine poet once again shines brightly in the *oikoumene*.

Byzantium itself had quickly acknowledged the genius of the poet from Syria. One tradition claims that he enjoyed imperial favor. At least it is very probable that Justinian (reg. 527-565), himself a writer of hymns, knew about Romanos, the most prolific and brilliant hymnographer in his empire. A grateful church enrolled him among her saints, honoring his memory on October 1. His cult spread abroad to Armenia and Russia where he was known as the "Singer of Sweetness."

Nevertheless, after his lifetime (he died sometime in the second half of the sixth century), changing fashions in liturgical poetry condemned Romanos to undeserved oblivion. Until the chance discovery by Cardinal J. B. Pitra in St. Petersburg in 1859, for a long millennium the poems of Romanos lay forgotten in ecclesiastical service books, scattered from Grottaferrata eastward to Russia.

Pitra not only discovered Romanos. Fortunately he also recognized his genius. In 1876 he published twenty-nine kontakia and fragments. The first volume of *Analecta Sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata* (Paris, 1876) marks the beginning of modern scholarship and interest in Byzantium's greatest poet.

Since the pioneering works of Pitra (1812-89) and Karl Krumbacher (1856-1909), *Studia Romanica* have advanced significantly. Many special studies have illuminated various problems of sources, chronology, linguistics, metrics and text. Much, however, remains to be done. The availability now of a sound text will certainly stimulate further intensive study of Eastern Orthodoxy's sacred poet.

Recent years have seen the publication of three editions of St. Romanos: that by N. B. Tomadakis and twenty-five of his students (Athens, 1952-61); the volume of the fifty-nine kontakia, considered by the editors to be genuine, edited by Paul Maas and C. A. Trypanis (Oxford, 1963); and the four volumes under review. Now at last students of poetry can approach a major poet hitherto inaccessible, while Byzantinists can hear clearly the true voice of Byzantium.

Grosdidier de Matons plans a large edition of the *corpus Romanicum* in three parts. These four volumes which have already appeared comprise the first part. The eight kontakia of the first volume deal with figures and

events derived from the Old Testament. The remaining three volumes include thirty-seven kontakia based on the New Testament and dealing with the life of Christ. These Christological hymns are the most important part of Romanos' poetry. They include his masterpieces, the highest achievements of Christian hymnography.

St. Romanos, a complex and difficult poet even to his contemporaries, confronts every editor with formidable challenges. Grosdidier de Matons, learned and careful in his scholarship and sensitive in his appreciation, does justice to the Byzantine poet.

Each of the forty-five kontakia receives equal treatment; an introduction precedes every hymn. In it the editor discusses briefly the poem's textual tradition, theme, style and meter. A translation into French and a few footnotes face each page of Greek text. The text of each hymn is carefully reconstructed from its own tradition.

Many textual difficulties beset the editor of this sixth-century poet. Since four centuries separate the oldest extant manuscript from the hymn which came from the poet's pen, the textual tradition is often unreliable. Furthermore, the text itself is often obscure.

Many factors contribute to this obscurity; the language of Romanos which is both scriptural and popular; the freedom and irregularity of syntax; the lavish use of metaphor; an exuberant taste for puns and word-play; a rich vocabulary; and a typically Byzantine delight in theology.

In view of these problems, Grosdidier de Matons exercises "un éeclectisme prudent" (vol. 1, p. 49). As a result we have a text which is reliable and conservative. The editor, however, does not shrink from proposing or adopting conjectures.

The accompanying translations, which do not attempt to reproduce the richly varied rhythms of the original, are helpful. Again, the language and style of the kontakion, half hymn and half sermon, didactic and lyric, make translation difficult. Grosdidier de Matons deserves our gratitude for both the text and the translation.

His work has brought us nearer to the person and poetry of St. Romanos, who fourteen hundred years ago in Constantinople composed sublime hymns to be sung in the Eastern Church. While serving as deacon in a church dedicated to the Theotokos, by his songs St. Romanos also served God and man for all time.

The Greek poet Kostis Palamas (1859-1943) wrote of the poet

He  
Alone beholds thee face to face  
O God; and he alone,  
Reaching into thy heart, reveals  
To us Thy mysteries.

(tr. Phoutrides)

Romanos was such a poet. For this reason we try to reach into his heart and song.

EVA C. TOPPING  
*Cincinnati, Ohio*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

## A SERENDIP DISCOVERED ON A TRIP TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

By BARBARA BROWN

(in collaboration with EMILIANOS, Metropolitan of Seleucia)

The St. Mark's Library of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America has in its possession an eleventh-century Greek Gospel manuscript which is described in the second volume of Seymour de Ricci's *Census of medieval and renaissance manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (p. 1284). The book was presented to the Seminary in 1913 by friends of the Seminary and the Society for promoting Religion and Learning, who had obtained it from J. Martini, who had purchased it in January of that year from two Greeks claiming to have brought it from the Lavra (Athos).

When the book was purchased for the Seminary, its donors were under the impression that it was of an earlier date than subsequent investigation proved it to be. It has, therefore, received little attention, except for the fact that it was lent in 1953 to the Toledo (Ohio) Museum of Art for an exhibition of medieval and renaissance music manuscripts. In the published catalog of that exhibition it was noted that on five of the pages of the manuscript ekphonic notation had been added at a later date in green ink and that this notation pointed to the use of this codex in church services.

In December of 1967, Dr. Niels H. Sonne, Librarian of the General Theological Seminary, called my attention to this manuscript with the thought that I might be interested in those pages which had musical notation. My first task was to find the pages in question. The Gospel narratives, in the canonical order, are written on each page in brown ink, with red chapter headings and references to the commentary which is written in smaller brown script in the upper, outer, and lower margins. As I studied the manuscript, I did, indeed, find five pages on which there were ekphonic signs (with both punctuating and musical significance) written in green ink over the Gospel text: pp. 12b, 13a, 21a, 190b, and 255a. Xerox reproductions of these pages are appended to this article. Since the differentiation in the colors of ink used does not show in the Xerox reproductions, I have circled the ekphonic characters to distinguish them from the normal textual accent and breathing marks and have indicated by means of brackets the be-



ginnings and endings of the noted passages.

My next question was to find out why the notation appeared on only these five scattered pages. In this effort, His Eminence the Metropolitan was of the greatest assistance to me. I worked with the texts and with modern Greek and English New Testament versions until the Gospel passages were identified — two from Matthew and one each from Luke and John (the first two consecutive pages being one continuous passage from Matthew). I then studied the passages and found their connection: they were portions of the Gospel for Matins of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Passion Week (sung in each instance by anticipation the preceding evening) and for Matins preceding the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil on the morning of Great Holy Thursday.

But in each case the passage with ekphonic notation was not the whole Gospel portion indicated for the service in question, and this fact puzzled me until I learned that in the Eastern Orthodox Church the cantillation of the Gospels is not done according to fixed patterns and that the Gospeller is free to chant the lections in whatever way he thinks will best express their meaning. The Gospel manuscript which I had been studying must have belonged at one time to a cleric who had wanted to work out his chanting of portions of the Holy Week Gospels with great care and had written in notational signs to remind himself of the interpretation which he had decided to give to certain salient passages.

It may be well at this point to append a description of these services in the Eastern Orthodox Churches, since they differ considerably in their ethos from the Passion Week services in the Western rites. In the West, the attitude is one of rejoicing because of the salvation which our Lord wrought for us through his mighty acts during the last week of His earthly life. The service of Matins on each of the first three days of Holy Week consists, in the Eastern Churches, of the Ceremony of the Bridegroom. These services, with censings and alleluias, serve as festive preludes to the dramatic events of the latter portion of the week, always looking beyond the passion to the resurrection which is to be its crown. One is reminded of Johann Sebastian Bach's moving use of the Passion Chorale with brilliant trumpet accompaniments in the "Christmas Oratorio," following which the trumpets are silent until the joy of Easter makes them sound again. The theme of the Bridegroom focuses attention on Christ's second coming in judgment and glory and adds further solemnity to the mys-

teries of the passion and the resurrection. The Ceremony of the Bridegroom consists of psalms, prayers, hymns, and a Gospel lesson, with each one of the three Ceremonies having its own special theme. The character of each of the three days may be gathered from the synaxarion for the day (my quotations are from the *Book of Divine Prayers and Services of the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ*, compiled and arranged by the Reverend Seraphim Nassar, New York, The Blackshaw Press, Inc., 1938):

*Synaxarion for Great Holy Monday:* On this day begins the anniversary of the holy Passion of the Saviour, he of whom Joseph of exceeding beauty is taken as the earliest symbol; for this Joseph was the eleventh of the sons of Jacob, and because his father loved him exceedingly, his brothers envied him and threw him into a pit. Then they took him out and sold him to strangers, who sold him in Egypt. He was slandered for his chastity, and was thrown into prison. But finally he was taken out of prison, and he attained a high rank, and received honours worthy of kings, becoming governor of the whole of Egypt, whose people he supported. Thus he symbolized in himself the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ and his consequent great glory (Gen. 40:41).

To the remembrance of Joseph is added the story of the fig tree which the Lord cursed on this day (corresponding at that time to the nineteenth of the month of March) because of its barrenness, so that it dried up. The fig tree was a symbol of the Council of the Jews which did not show the necessary fruits of virtue and righteousness, so that Christ stripped it of every spiritual grace (St. Mt. 21:18-20).

Wherefore, by the intercessions of all-comely Joseph, O Christ, have mercy upon us.

The Gospel for the day is Matthew 21:18-43, the portion included in the first two pages of our manuscript's notation being as follows (vv. 19-30):

. . . and found nothing thereon, but leaves only; and he saith unto it, Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward for ever. And immediately the fig tree withered away.

And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How did the fig tree immediately wither away?

And Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say

unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done.

And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

And when he was come to the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people come unto him as he was teaching, and said: By what authority doest thou these things? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one question, which if ye tell me, I likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things.

The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or from men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven, he will say unto us, Why then did ye not believe him?

But if we will say, From men: we fear the multitude; for all hold John as a prophet.

And they answered Jesus, and said: We know not. He also said unto them: Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

But what think ye? A man had two sons: and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work today in the vineyard.

And he answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented himself, and went.

And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not.

In the hymns and prayers of the ceremony, the example of the fruitfulness of Joseph and the unfruitfulness of the fig tree are applied to the individual believer, as should they not be also to the Church? If the Church is to survive judgment in this generation, must it not care for the widow and the orphan, the sick, the needy, those living for years in refugee camps, even as did the apostolic Church? Is the Church today any better than the Council of the Jews if it is not showing the compassion of Joseph and of Christ to its children everywhere? What will the Bridegroom say if He comes, suddenly?

*Synaxarion for Great Holy Tuesday:* On this day we make remembrance of the Parable of the Ten Virgins which Jesus spake along with others as he was coming to the Passion.

It teaches us not to rest as though safe in virginity, but to guard it whenever possible, and not to desist from any virtues and good deeds, especially deeds of mercy, which make the lamp of virginity shine brilliantly. It teaches us also to be ready for our end, not knowing when our hour is coming, as the wise virgins were ready to meet the bridegroom, lest death overtake us and close the door of the heavenly chamber in our face, and we hear the terrible judgment which the foolish virgins heard, Verily, verily, I know you not (St. Mt. 25:1-13).

Wherefore, O Christ the Bridegroom, number us with the wise virgins and have mercy upon us. Amen.

The Gospel for the day is found in Matthew 22:15 to the end and 23. The section which is noted in the Seminary manuscript is Matthew 23:35 to the end:

. . . all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!

Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.

For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

The ideas expressed in the synaxarion, as well as those found in the parables of the talents and of the prodigal son, are applied in the ceremony to the soul of the faithful believer, who is longing to meet the Bridegroom when He comes to the marriage feast. Always the emphasis is on charity and on compassion on the part of the believer if he is to hope for a place at the banquet table.

*Synaxarion for Great Holy Wednesday:* The more accurate and exacting of the commentators on the four Gospels say that two women anointed the Lord, one long before his Passion, and one a few days before. One of these was a harlot,

while the other was a chaste, virtuous woman. On this day the Church commemorates this act of piety and righteousness which proceeded from the harlot, contrasting it with the treachery of Judas and his Betrayal of Christ. Both of these acts fell on Wednesday, corresponding to the twenty-first of March, two days before the Mosaic passover, as it appears from the course of the account of St. Matthew the Evangelist.

The above mentioned harlot anointed the head and feet of Jesus with spikenard, and wiped them with the hair of her head. The precious ointment was worth three hundred dinars, or about fifteen pieces of Venetian gold. When the Disciples saw this they stumbled, especially Judas, the money-lover, and were angry because of the wasting of such an amount of ointment. Jesus rebuked them, lest the woman be embarrassed. Judas was wroth, and went to the high priests, where they were gathered in the house of Caiaphas, taking counsel against Jesus, and agreed with them to deliver the Master for thirty pieces of silver. From that time Judas sought an opportunity to deliver him (St. Mt. 26:2-16). Because of this the fast of Wednesday was instituted from the days of the apostolic age itself.

Wherefore, O Christ God, anointed with the supersensuous ointment, deliver us from suffering, and have mercy upon us.

The Gospel for the day is found in John 12:17 to the end. The noted portion is from verse 49 to the end:

. . . he gave me a command, what I should say, and what I should speak.

And I know that this commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

May not the repentant woman stand for the whole Church, the bride whom Christ is returning to claim? Surely the Church cannot hope to be received unless it has first been forgiven!

The Gospel reading for Matins on Great Holy Thursday is St. Luke 22:1-39, with only verses 37-39 being noted in the Seminary manuscript:

For I say to you, that this that is written must yet be ful-

filled in me: And with the wicked was he reckoned. For the things concerning me have an end.

But they said: Lord, behold here are two swords. And he said to them, It is enough.

And going out, he went, according to his custom, to the mount of Olives. And his disciples also followed him.

And so the journey back to the eleventh century comes to an end. It has been my unexpected pleasure through my study of the Gospel manuscript to become acquainted with the rich, yet unfamiliar, tradition of services during Holy Week in the Eastern Orthodox Church and to feel a kind of bond of friendship over the years with the unknown cleric who took special pains to prepare himself to chant these Gospel passages in an expressive way.

LONDON, ENGLAND

[illegible]









πρόσθετον  
 κῶσαι δὲ μάλλον ἢ προσάχαι· ὡς αἴψω, ποιήται τοῦ πη-  
 σμοῦ τὴν παρὰ ἱστορίαν· ὡς ἔσ' ὑπαρχομένων κατ' ἡμᾶς

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

## *The Seminary*

### ORDINATIONS

FLESER, Richard ('71) was ordained to the Diaconate by His Grace, Bishop Valerian at the Chapel of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Grass Lake, Michigan, on May 31, 1970.

GHARFEH, Samir ('71) was ordained to the Diaconate by His Eminence, Metropolitan Philip at St. George Church in Worcester, Massachusetts, on June 14, 1970.

HAMPERZONIAN, Jerry ('70) was ordained to the Diaconate by His Grace, Bishop Dimitri at St. Vladimir's Seminary Chapel, Crestwood, New York, on June 15, 1970; to the Holy Priesthood by His Beatitude, Metropolitan Ireney, at Holy Protection Cathedral in New York City, on June 21, 1970.

HOMIAK, Fr. Deacon David ('70) was ordained to the Holy Priesthood by His Grace, Bishop Theodosius, at St. Vladimir's Seminary Chapel in Crestwood, New York, on May 28, 1970.

### COMMENCEMENT 1970

The address at the graduation exercises on May 28, 1970 was given by His Eminence, The Most Reverend Vladimir, Archbishop of Tokyo and Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church of Japan on the subject of "The Orthodox Church in Japan."

His Beatitude, Metropolitan Ireney, President, presented the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity to the following:

DONALD AUGUSTA

THE REVEREND ANTHONY BASSOLINE, *cum laude*

FAJER ELIAS

THE REVEREND ANGELO ESTRADA-REA

THE REVEREND GREGORY HAMPERZONIAN

JOHN HARVEY, *cum laude*

THE REVEREND DAVID HOMIAK  
MICHAEL F. LOBO ('66)  
THE REVEREND CYRIL LUKASHONAK  
LEONTY MATSUDA  
ALEXANDER PADLO  
THE REVEREND MICHAEL PSENECHNUK  
THE REVEREND PAUL ZIATYK ('64)

*The Degree of Master of Theology: to*

THE REVEREND GEORGE S. AFONSKY  
ARCHIMANDRITE IOANNIS MICHAEL MALLOURIS

*The Degree of Doctor of Divinity, honoris causa: to*

SOPHIE KOULOMZIN

Also present at the commencement exercises were His Eminence, Metropolitan Philip, of the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese and His Grace, Bishop Theodosius, of Sitka and Alaska.

---

### *Notes on Contributors*

JOHN H. ERICKSON is a candidate for the Ph.D. degree in Religious Studies at Yale University.

FR. PAUL LAZOR is Lecturer in Liturgics at St. Vladimir's.

FR. JOHN MEYENDORFF is Professor of Patristics and Church History at St. Vladimir's.

REV. JOHN ROSSNER is Professor of the History of Western Religious Thought at Sir George Williams University, Montreal.

FR. THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS is Assistant Professor of New Testament at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, Brookline, Mass.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Being that it is the first serious attempt to elucidate Nicholas Mysticos' place in history, the book should be considered of value, although its shortcomings are several and significant. Unless these are dealt in detail, Nicholas Mysticos will remain an incomplete chapter in the field of Byzantine scholarship.

NICHOLAS G. ITSINES  
*Staten Island, New York*

EDWARD P. ECHLIN, S.J., *The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective: Doctrine and Rite from Cranmer to Seabury*. New York: Seabury Press, 1968. Pp. 305. \$7.50.

This carefully documented and scholarly book with an ecumenical perspective, comes from the hands of a Roman Catholic for the sake of unity hopefully to come between his Church and the flock of Canterbury. Father Echlin, a Jesuit priest and professor at John Carroll University, Cleveland, since 1964, rather convincingly demonstrates the historical development of Anglican Eucharistic thought within the past two hundred forty years as coming closer to Rome, while at the same time the Roman Eucharistic thought as tending "to converge with the insights of Anglicanism."

In six chapters, nine forms of the Anglican Communion Services are examined with a concentration on the doctrines of Sacrifice and Real Presence from the period of Archbishop Cranmer (1549) and the dramatic revisions that followed in the years 1559, 1604, 1637, 1662, 1718, 1764, to the "Episcopal Mass" that was framed at Philadelphia under the powerful argumentation and persuasion of Bishop Samuel Seabury and his associates. The first American Bishop of his Church, having received Episcopal ordination from the Non-Juror Bishops of Scotland set out in that historical conference to have his ordination and the Scottish Canon with its emphasis on Sacrifice and Real Presence be accepted, and succeeded in both endeavors. Thus the long Eucharistic development that had begun in England at Thomas Cranmer's desk in the time of Reformation reached a consummation in the New World, in which time it moved closer to the Roman Mass, so close in fact, believes the author, that both became "identical" in essence. This conclusion is shared by the Joint Commission of Anglicans and Roman Catholics meeting at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 24-26, 1967, to discuss the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. In a joint statement the Commission stated that "since the time of the Reformation, the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice has been considered a major obstacle to the reconciliation of the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. It is the conviction of our commission that this is no longer true."

After establishing the substantial "identity" in the area of Eucharistic doctrine, the author proceeds in his concluding remarks to offer certain practical implications in the form of proposals. These are: first, that Anglican and Roman Catholic priests should concelebrate "when it is authorised by both Churches" in order to satisfy everyone that there is a "valid" Mass; secondly, that if the Mass takes place in a Roman Church, the Anglican Service be used and conversely, if in an Anglican that the



Roman Catholic Service be used; and finally, that the faithful present at these Eucharistic Services receive Communion from a priest *not* of their own Church," as a sign of the new unity that exists and a cause of the deep unity to come."

What Jesuit Echlin is advocating, if I read him correctly, is "Communicatio in Sacris" before dogmatic union is established by the two now separate Churches, a view which I am afraid his Church will discourage. Vatican II in the Decree of Ecumenism formally promulgated that the teaching "concerning the Lord's Supper and other Sacraments between the separated Churches and Ecclesial Communities in the West, be the subject of the dialogue" while at the same time exhorting the faithful "to refrain from any superficiality and imprudent zeal which can hinder the real progress toward unity." The author in his zeal mistakenly labors under the Anglican way of "comprehensiveness" which is diametrically opposed to the "exclusiveness" of his Church.

Nevertheless the study is valuable and may prove helpful to the coming dialogue between the Roman Catholics and Anglicans, and perhaps to other Christians who quest for unity in the "breaking of bread."

GEORGE J. TSOMAS  
*Hellenic College*

EDWARD LEROY LONG, JR., *A Survey of Christian Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967. Pp. 342. \$6.50.

The present volume is an attempt to systematize the whole range of contemporary ethical discussion as familiar to the Western world. The author begins with a survey of the place of ethics in the contemporary secular milieu, with emphasis in philosophy and the social sciences, and follows this by relating religion, morality, and Christian ethics. The body of the book is divided into two major concerns, (1) the formulation of the ethical norm and (2) the implementation of ethical decisions. The conceptual tool used to handle the vast array of material is the idea of the "motif," generally unified patterns of approach by which the data of Christian ethics is handled. Long sees three such "motifs" as Christians have sought to work out the ethical implications of the Christian faith as a norm or standard for Christian living. The deliberative motif places the emphasis on the concept of Reason; here "deliberative and rational judgments are used to formulate the ethical norm" (p. 45). Aquinas, scholastic theology, and Kantian-influenced Protestant thought, with their emphasis on the primacy of reason, are first discussed. This then is followed by a discussion of Harnack, Knudson, Garrod, Osborn, Ramsey, and Reinhold Niebuhr, who are seen as appropriating to the ends of Christian ethical discourse aspects of philosophical discourse.

The second motif is the prescriptive motif, which sets the Christian ethical endeavor in a pattern of rules or codes. The biblical background and the approach to it from the prescriptive points of view of such scholars as Dodd, Wycliff, Calvin, John Murray, and Carl Henry are first delineated. The code approaches in the Apostolic Fathers, medieval Canon Law, Henry

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

salvation as God's "invasion" into history. All of this is illustrated by examination of topics such as the Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, and the Life of the Spirit. The author is extremely concerned also to show that this pattern of New Testament truth stands in sharp contrast to the Greek or Platonic viewpoint (e.g., Philo, Plutarch), which involves cosmological dualism and conceives of salvation as flight of the soul to a transcendental world.

The author achieves his aims but is overly schematic and evaluates Hebraic and Greek thought from a dated perspective. He works under the assumption that unity is good and diversity bad, and that Greek influence on Hebraic thought has the same effect as falsehood upon truth. It is interesting that, in his introductory chapter entitled "The Background of the Pattern: Greek or Hebrew?" the author tends to compare only classical Judaism with Greek thought. He hardly looks at late Judaism, the immediate background of the New Testament, which in many ways, and especially in terms of the author's own schemata, comes closer to "the Greek view" of salvation. For it cannot be denied that, unlike classical Old Testament thought, late Judaism and the New Testament conceive of salvation as an extension of existence beyond this life and as a radical transformation of earthly existence. Furthermore, if such schematization be allowed so as to claim a basic unity between the proclamations of Jesus and Paul because both speak of God's "invasion" into history (p. 89), then it seems equally permissible to contend, as some have contended, that a basic unity exists also between Hebraic and Greek thought because both are ultimately concerned with permanent reality and enduring truth.

THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS  
*Hellenic College*

JOHN WEBSTER GRANT, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (Ecumenical Studies in History, No. 8). Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967. Pp. 106. \$1.95.

This important book is for all those who work in the frontiers of the Ecumenical Movement. I say this because the author deals with the formation of the United Church of Canada in 1925 by the union of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. The astonishing fact which might impress the reader is that this union took place more than forty years ago, when the spirit of Ecumenicity among the Churches had not kindled the fire of the Ecumenical understanding of the two recent decades. Rightly, the author observes that this "Canadian experience" is a "lesson from history," for it shows all the vicissitudes and the painful but enriching process of uniting together churches which in reality had not profound reasons to live and exist separated.

There is no doubt that the first English-speaking settlers of Canada established a pattern of religious diversity. This religious pluralism (although the British Colonial Office, in order to avoid a repetition of the American Revolution, set up a local aristocracy and a local establishment of religion for the exclusive benefit of the Church of England), combined

with ethnic plurality, the vastness of the country, the necessity of a united front in confronting the problems of fractionalism in all walks of social, political, and national life, made almost mandatory the union of the churches. The Canadian statesmen as well the Canadian clergymen realized that their nation could survive the dangers of ethnic and religious pluralism, as well as the sparsity of the population in their vast country, only by national and ecclesiastical unity which at the same would assert the identity of the nation and preserve the distinctive tone and color of the country. The American dictum of the "separation of Church and State" has never aptly applied to the Canadian situation, since Canada grew up in the nineteenth century under the tutelage of its Churches. Thus the author points out that size, comprehensiveness, and Canadianism led to the Church union he speaks about.

Of course, neither political motives nor sheer Canadianism could explain the success of this endeavor. The general lowering of the theological barriers separating the various branches of Protestantism and the growing common interest in biblical criticism, German idealism, and social reconstruction provided the common ground upon which the desire for unity could be built. Moreover, this union should be understood as a sharing of inheritances, that the identities of the uniting churches should be preserved in the new Church and that this new Church was not to mean the extinction of Methodism, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism.

Naturally, opponents of this union came from all sides. A wave of secessions, transfers of minorities, new foundations, the breaking up of congregations, even of families and friendships, followed. Then the difficulties and the hindrances of making the new Church into a single functioning body came up. For instance, one had to sort out the complications of putting furnished Presbyterian ministers into already furnished parsonages, and unfurnished Methodist ministers into unfurnished manses, and the author frankly concedes that there still are problems which concern the new Church, for the process of blending was uneven and remains incomplete.

There are still some congregations that retain their original polity, a few that expect their minister to be of a particular background, and many whose past affiliations are plainly visible. Of course, the United Church has been accused of being "creedless," that her members are not interested in the nature of the Church but only in her functioning as an "organization church," and that its missionary force has been diminished. There is also the fact that recent discussions and a prolonged dialogue with the Church of England in Canada for a future union did not bear fruitful results up to this moment. In any case Grant's book is a "must" for the Ecumenical-minded clergymen and scholars, for it amply shows both the advantages as well as the weaknesses of such an undertaking, i.e. of uniting churches which, although they have a common denominator — their Protestant background — still wrestle with their differences and unavoidable sectarianism.

GEORGE S. BEBIS  
*Hellenic College*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

sade — the Norman invasion of 1185, Barbarossa's threat and the continued Hohenstauffen enmity, the tangled relations with the Italian trading cities of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, the various attempts to arrange matters with the papacy — all coming together in the events of 1203-4. This technique has a logical foundation — an unbroken narrative would surely hide the Western problem which is the book's focus behind the masses of data — and many successes. The character of Andronicus is properly left ambiguous. The wrestlings of Isaac Angelus with a host of difficulties is thoroughly presented, and as a result Isaac shows himself to be a very human figure: the middling man, not too bright but obstinately willing, over his head in a tangled job but making the best of it. Brand's emperors are all well done; he avoids the psychological probings and pseudo-typologies which bring their own traps, and musters the detail which implicitly describes the living, historical man, his wars and his triumphs.

Brand has in fact chosen to avoid the dramatic effect of large theories of historical connection or causation. His empire lurches into and out of peril, until at last it finds itself in a state of terminal crisis, from which neither rational policy nor luck could extricate it. The dense tone of the narrative is reinforced by Brand's close scrutiny of the primary sources, especially the courtier-rhetor-historian Nicetas Choniates: without borrowing the biases of this writer, Brand has caught the genuine feeling of his ornate perceptions. All this is to the good, in this modern age of over-theorizing. At the same time, some wider views might have been tried out without destroying the fabric of the study. The social dislocation in the empire is described but its roots remain mostly unexamined; this is also true of the crisis in leadership and responsibility in the civil and military aristocracies. The Fourth Crusade itself is pictured as a complicated but flat and two-dimensioned phenomenon: like all the crusades, the Fourth had a base in social pathology, in apocalyptic dreams which surfaced in violent destruction. On another level, a rigorous editing would have removed the slightly syncopated texture of the book: facts and relationships are repeated (or sometimes contradicted: see Frederick Barbarossa's attitude on p. 176 and p. 184, or Manuel's two Genoese policies on p. 207). The organization of the second part of the study is not as clear as it might be. In any event, Brand has researched deeply and written well, and his book should be an important secondary work in the working library of anyone trying to understand the disintegrating mosaic of Byzantine civilization in the general context of medieval history.

D. A. MILLER

*The University of Rochester*

*The Festal Menaion.* Translated from the original Greek by Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware. Introduction by Georges Florovsky. London: Faber and Faber, 1969. Pp. 564. 84 s.

The translators of the *Festal Menaion* have performed an extraordinary service to all English speaking Orthodox Christians with their presentation

in English of the liturgical texts of nine of the most important feasts of the Orthodox Church: the Birth of Our Most Holy Lady the Theotokos (Sept. 8), the Universal Exaltation of the Precious and Life-Giving Cross (Sept. 14), the Entrance of the Most Holy Theotokos into the Temple (Nov. 21), the Nativity According to the Flesh of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Dec. 25), the Holy Theophany of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Jan. 6), the Meeting of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Feb. 2), the Annunciation of the Most Holy Theotokos and Ever-Virgin Mary (Mar. 25), the Transfiguration of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ (Aug. 6), and the Dormition of Our Most Holy Lady the Theotokos and Ever-Virgin Mary (Aug. 15).

In addition to an excellent introduction on worship in the Orthodox Church by Professor Georges Florovsky, the volume includes a good explanation of the structure of Orthodox services, the background and meaning of the nine feasts, as well as the texts for the forefeast of Christmas (Dec. 24) and Theophany (Jan. 5), and the Synaxis of the Theotokos (Dec. 26) and of John the Baptist (Jan. 7).

The volume concludes with four very useful appendices: the numbering of the Greek Psalter and its liturgical division, the service books of the Orthodox Church, a glossary of liturgical terms, and a brief discussion of the use of the calendar in the Orthodox Church.

This reviewer cannot but express admiration for the scholarship and the industry of the translators for what must certainly have been a labor of love. The need for such a work in English is admirably set forth by them in their preface. Certainly it is time that English speaking Orthodox Christians had both an accurate and beautiful translation of some of their liturgical treasures.

Yet one is saddened by the decision (understandable as it may be because of the place of origin of the translation) made to use the language of the King James Bible in the translation. Because our Orthodox forefathers made the great error of not using a contemporary or spoken language when they composed the hymns and the texts of the various services is not sufficient reason to continue the practice. Did not this error contribute to the unintelligibility of the services for the vast majority of Orthodox Christians over a span of many centuries? It may certainly be true that "for three centuries and more the Authorized Version and along with it the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, have provided the words with which English speaking people throughout the world have addressed God," but it does not necessarily follow, for example, that present day English speaking Orthodox Christians the world over have shared this inheritance nor that it is a contemporary reality, especially in the United States. This reasoning perhaps may be valid for Orthodox people of British origin, but for few others the existence of a new "English Bible" speaks for itself.

Even more regrettable is the decision to use the Authorized Version for the Scriptural readings instead of either the English or American modern translations of the Bible. One cannot argue convincingly here that the Greek used in the Scriptures is the language employed in the original texts of the services. The Scriptures were written in a contemporary lan-

guage. Although, as the translators correctly note, it is not a simple matter of substituting one translation for another (because of the use of the Septuagint by the Orthodox Church), this reviewer earnestly hopes that they will reconsider the question of language for their subsequent labors.

As it stands, the *Festal Menaion* is an excellent contribution to religious literature in English. For Orthodox Christians it fills an important need. It is a volume that should be read and studied by all English speaking Christians and should be used in all Orthodox churches where English is employed.

N. M. VAPORIS

*Hellenic College*

JOHN CHR. CONSTANTINIDES, *Νικόλαος Α' ὁ Μυστικός (ca 852-925 μ.Χ.) Πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (901-907, 912-925). Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ α' τετάρτου τοῦ Ι' μ.Χ. αἰῶνος*. Athens, 1967. Pp. 221.

Byzantine scholarship has been waiting for some time now for a study on the great early tenth century Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticos. This has been fulfilled to an extent in Modern Greek by Dr. John Constantinides, in his doctoral dissertation for the Theological School of the University of Athens. Although the book can only be characterized as an introduction, it deserves to be examined for being the first comprehensive scientific study on the Patriarch.

The work in question is divided into two parts. The first deals with Mysticos as an ecclesiastical and political personality, while the second examines him as a writer and theologian.

The author follows a strict chronological order in his examination of the life and activities of Nicholas in the first chapter. He examines in turn Nicholas's first term in office (901-07) and his involvement in the problem of Leo VI's fourth marriage, his exile and the accession of Euthymios as Patriarch, his return to office in 912 and his activities during the turbulent years 912-919, and it ends with his career in the course of Romanos Lecapenos' reign until his death in 925. Unfortunately, the narrative is generally speaking brief and restricted, making it quite impossible to explore from all angles the Patriarch's activities in the political scene, during this complicated period of Byzantine history.

The following chapter is devoted to Nicholas' missionary activities among the Alans of Caucasus and the Chazars, and to his relations with the Armenians. It was his ardent wish to win all the Armenians to the faith of Chalcedon and hopefully to the complete Byzantine sphere of influence, but to no avail. The first part closes with a chapter concerning the relations between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople during this period. It examines to a greater detail the problem of the fourth marriage and the ensuing schism, the correspondence of Mysticos with his counterparts in Rome, and the restoration of relations in 923.

Dr. Constantinides cites the various agreeable and disagreeable sources



#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

doctrine is already offered by the number of references under the same title" (p. ix).

Concerning the choice of the words, Prof. Alberigo affirms that the emphasis is given by the Institute to the *doctrine* and *not* to the *language*. For this reason the substantives, verbs, and qualitative adjectives are without exception included in the inventory. Words without significance for the establishment of a doctrine are generally omitted (*ibid.* and p. x).

In the preparation of the textual sections there was the inevitable selection to make: that of determining the words which give the principal meaning to a sentence. "Any ambiguity or alteration of the meaning of the text has been avoided" (p. xi).

The preface is followed by the text of the Council (pp. 1-54), the inventory (pp. 58-229), and the tables (233-244). The inventory and the tables are the work of all the scholars doing research at the Institute, supervised and directed to completion by Dr. Franca Magistretti.

What is peculiar to this edition of the text is that the famous *Nota praevia* (preliminary note) to the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, which comes directly from the *Acts* of the Council and does not appear in the official publication of the conciliary texts, is edited here at the end of the official text (pp. 55-56).

As for the second volume, on the *Decree on Ecumenism*, the same introduction by Prof. Alberigo (second part, pp. vii-x) precedes the edition of the official text (pp. 1-15). The same patterns used for the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* are used here also in the inventory (pp. 17-78) and the tables of quotations (pp. 79-83).

We deeply appreciate this valuable work of the Institute of Bologna. It gives skillfully prepared, well introduced, and extensively documented inventories on the single documents of the Second Vatican Council. For all those who are, in one way or another, concerned with the work and doctrine of Vatican II, these inventories are of great importance for the proper comprehension and the organization of materials in its texts. The various tables at the end give us an image of the quantity and quality of biblical, patristic, and other quotations used by the Council, permitting a rapid and facile evaluation of its work. We hope to see the series of inventories completed soon. We cannot but thank Prof. Alberigo for having taken the initiative for such a useful and praiseworthy enterprise.

MAXIMOS AGHIORGOUSSIS  
Hellenic College

GEORGE ELDON LADD, *The Pattern of New Testament Truth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968. Pp. 119. \$3.75.

This book by the well-known Evangelical scholar proposes to demonstrate that a basic unity or "pattern" underlies the Synoptics, John and Paul. According to the author, these main strata of the New Testament have in common (1) the same view of God, man, and the world, (2) the Hebraic background, (3) ethical dualism, and (4) an understanding of

salvation as God's "invasion" into history. All of this is illustrated by examination of topics such as the Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, and the Life of the Spirit. The author is extremely concerned also to show that this pattern of New Testament truth stands in sharp contrast to the Greek or Platonic viewpoint (e.g., Philo, Plutarch), which involves cosmological dualism and conceives of salvation as flight of the soul to a transcendental world.

The author achieves his aims but is overly schematic and evaluates Hebraic and Greek thought from a dated perspective. He works under the assumption that unity is good and diversity bad, and that Greek influence on Hebraic thought has the same effect as falsehood upon truth. It is interesting that, in his introductory chapter entitled "The Background of the Pattern: Greek or Hebrew?" the author tends to compare only classical Judaism with Greek thought. He hardly looks at late Judaism, the immediate background of the New Testament, which in many ways, and especially in terms of the author's own schemata, comes closer to "the Greek view" of salvation. For it cannot be denied that, unlike classical Old Testament thought, late Judaism and the New Testament conceive of salvation as an extension of existence beyond this life and as a radical transformation of earthly existence. Furthermore, if such schematization be allowed so as to claim a basic unity between the proclamations of Jesus and Paul because both speak of God's "invasion" into history (p. 89), then it seems equally permissible to contend, as some have contended, that a basic unity exists also between Hebraic and Greek thought because both are ultimately concerned with permanent reality and enduring truth.

THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS  
*Hellenic College*

JOHN WEBSTER GRANT, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (Ecumenical Studies in History, No. 8). Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967. Pp. 106. \$1.95.

This important book is for all those who work in the frontiers of the Ecumenical Movement. I say this because the author deals with the formation of the United Church of Canada in 1925 by the union of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. The astonishing fact which might impress the reader is that this union took place more than forty years ago, when the spirit of Ecumenicity among the Churches had not kindled the fire of the Ecumenical understanding of the two recent decades. Rightly, the author observes that this "Canadian experience" is a "lesson from history," for it shows all the vicissitudes and the painful but enriching process of uniting together churches which in reality had not profound reasons to live and exist separated.

There is no doubt that the first English-speaking settlers of Canada established a pattern of religious diversity. This religious pluralism (although the British Colonial Office, in order to avoid a repetition of the American Revolution, set up a local aristocracy and a local establishment of religion for the exclusive benefit of the Church of England), combined

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

## WHICH COUNCILS ARE ECUMENICAL — FROM NICAEA TO VATICAN II?\*

By CARNEGIE SAMUEL CALIAN

One of the puzzling and pressing problems confronting contemporary Christians is the question of ecumenical councils. Which councils in the church's history are ecumenical? Vatican II and the World Council of Churches, as well as the important confessional conferences within Orthodoxy and Protestantism, highlight with theological urgency the question — Which church councils are ecumenical?

The World Council of Churches Commission on Faith and Order has begun already a study on the significance of the councils of the early church for the ecumenical movement.<sup>1</sup> The study seeks to answer such questions as "(a) How were the Councils convened; what was their membership; how was the consensus formed at the Council; to what authorities did the Councils appeal as normative? (b) Did the resolutions of the Councils have validity in themselves, or did this depend on their reception in the churches? (c) How did the word 'ecumenical' come into use in relation to the Councils?"<sup>2</sup> Our present discussion will pursue these topics in the following manner: first with a consideration of the priority of the Council of Nicaea; second with a brief survey of the councils and issues to Vatican II; and last, toward a theology of councils for the future.

Before we proceed, we must define our understanding of "ecumenical." The term "ecumenical" has had a venerable history

---

\* The substance of this present study was read at the American Academy of Religion annual meeting, in the fall, 1967. The author's most recent book *Icon and Pulpit, The Protestant-Orthodox Encounter*, was published by Westminster Press.

<sup>1</sup> See the report to the Commission on Faith and Order entitled, "The Importance of the Conciliar Process in the Ancient Church for the Ecumenical Movement," January 1967, obtainable through the division of Studies of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland.

<sup>2</sup> ———, Faith and Order Paper no. 44, Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission and Working Committee 1967 Aarhus, Denmark, p. 41, taken from the "Conspectus of Faith and Order Studies" (Geneva: W.C.C., 1965). See also, *ibid.*, pp. 70-1.

in Christendom.<sup>3</sup> Ecumenical (*oikoumene*) in its biblical usage connotes an inclusiveness of both space (the whole inhabited earth) and time (Israel and the nations of the world). The true ecumenical context in Scripture unites space and time eschatologically (Ps. 24 [cf. Septuagint Ps. 23:1] and Heb. 2:5) when the Lord of history will fellowship with the whole inhabited earth. From this eschatological perspective all ecclesiastical councils of whatever tradition are at best *pre-ecumenical*, signs pointing to what God has in store for a redeemed humanity. Our use of ecumenical in this study, however, is limited to Christians, and thus the *oikoumene* refers to the Christian *koinonia* throughout the inhabited earth. It should be kept in mind that *oikoumene* in its biblical setting is universal, missionary, and eschatological in uniting both space and time; thus it addresses itself to the totality of humanity past, present, and future.

### *The Priority of Nicaea*

Church councils had precedent long before the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.); in fact, the origin of church councils is said to be the meeting in Jerusalem (Acts 15; Galatians 2) traditionally referred to as the "Apostolic Council."<sup>4</sup> The reason for the pre-eminence in Christendom enjoyed by the Council of Nicaea is the set of factors which had previously never converged in the church's history. These factors give Nicaea an *ecumenical character*.

Emperor Constantine took the initiative for calling this unique council. The churchmen who gathered at Nicaea "were apparently able to embrace in one harmonious vision the universality of the empire and of the church and to regard the emperor's ecumenical gathering as a renewal of the miracle of Pentecost."<sup>5</sup> Nicaea was not a council of the East nor of the West, but symbolized the totality of Christendom at that time. "Even the Persian church of the Sassanid Empire received the decisions of the coun-

---

<sup>3</sup> See John A. Mackay, *Ecumenics: The Science of the Church Universal* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964); W. A. Visser 'T Hooft, *The Meaning of Ecumenical* (SGM Press, 1953); and standard lexical aids including Kittel.

<sup>4</sup> Hans J. Margull, ed., *The Councils of the Church* (Fortress Press, 1966), p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50. See for documents, J. Stevenson, ed., *Creed, Councils and Controversies* (New York: Seabury Press, 1966).

cil. To the present day the 'faith of Nicaea' continues to function as a bond of union for the large Christian churches."<sup>6</sup> The Nicene Creed,<sup>7</sup> for example, continues to be uttered in all the major traditions of Christendom exemplifying this common bond of unity (with the important exception of the *filioque* clause which appears only in the Western version of the creed).<sup>8</sup>

The ecumenical factors of universality and authority seen in Constantine's desire to hold a council are exceeded only by the prevailing mood of that time to establish unity both politically and ecclesiastically. Constantine viewed political and ecclesiastical unity as interdependent. The possibility of unity was threatened at the time by Arius and his followers.<sup>9</sup> It was Constantine's hope to establish a unifying bond among the feuding churchmen and thereby create the semblance of a state church. The fact that Constantine did not achieve his goal is reflected in the subsequent councils. For Constantine, the aim of the council was not that of expulsion (in this case with the Arians in their unorthodox teachings), but rather the task of the council was that of setting forth the truth in a spirit of unity among the assembled clergy and laity at Nicaea. "It was Constantine's desire to crown the great work of pacification by readmitting, after a suitable period of time, the Arians who had been excluded in 325. The synod, or a committee of the synod, presumably reassembled in 327, declared Arius' most recent and quite obscure confession to the orthodox, and resolved that he be reconciled to the church.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Also referred to later as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed with the added clauses on the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Reformation also acknowledged this as an ecumenical symbol, and like the ancient church in both East and West, utilized it on Sundays. (*Ibid.*, pp. 57-58); see as well J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 2nd ed. (Harper & Brothers, 1960), especially Part III.

<sup>8</sup> It is interesting to note here that the United Presbyterian new *Book of Common Worship* (Provisional Services and Lectionary for the Christian Year) omits the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed in its Service for the Lord's Day (p. 25). Whether this was consciously done by the committee for the sake of unity between the East and West is not documented in the text. In any case, it is significant that the clause has been removed.

<sup>9</sup> The Arians, it will be recalled, advocated the absolute uniqueness and transcendence of God and thereby rejected the divinity of Jesus Christ. They believed that it was an offense to God to declare that the Son was not created

The emperor lifted the order of banishment. But the successor of Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, who had taken part in the Council of Nicaea as a deacon, did not accept this decision. With this refusal begins a new phase of the trinitarian controversy, the struggle over the proper understanding of Nicaea."<sup>10</sup> In short, the Council of Nicaea expressed ecumenical qualities of universality and authority, but did not restore unity to the church.

The Council of Nicaea also introduced catholicity. The concept of catholicity implies far more than geographical universality; it points to the qualitative spirit of unity symbolized by the gathering. Catholicity also refers to the dogmatic presuppositions underlying the life of the church. The question of truth and faithfulness to the Gospel is then at stake under the category of catholicity. The aim of the council was to protect the truth of the Gospel. Thus the council set forth a *necessarium* of Christian belief without presenting a compendium of theological truths. The council sought to emphasize the fundamental truth inherent in the Gospel with Scripture as the essential guideline to the apostolic mind.

It is important to note here that most of the early councils met after the canon was closed. The Council fathers considered themselves subject to the Scriptures as their norm.<sup>11</sup> The Council of Nicaea also sought to establish this quality of catholicity (and apostolicity) centered in the Gospel and perpetuated by the canon and tradition. From the standpoint of catholicity then, Nicaea was more than a conference; it was a confrontation and directive to be obedient to the truth — it can be interpreted as being faithful to the spirit of the emerging canon. Those at Nicaea were desirous of expressing the truth (or dogma) of the gospel in a binding way. The Council of Nicaea thus delineated theologically the meaning of catholicity for the Christendom of that day.

In addition to the ecumenical dimension of catholicity, universality, authority and unity, the Council of Nicaea enjoyed almost immediate *reception* by Christians throughout the land. Reception by the laity is an important criterion for the ecumenicity of a council. This concept of reception is especially important from the Orthodox viewpoint. For the Orthodox, the legitimacy

---

<sup>10</sup> Margull, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>11</sup> Faith and Order Report, *op. cit.*, p. 8.



of a council is dependent on the response of the laity. "The laity, which constitutes the bulk of the body of Christ, constantly collaborates with the clergy in the task of defending and teaching dogma and tradition. Since a universal council is the visible instrument of the tradition, it must be aware of the feelings of the people, who are responsible for putting the canons into effect. Church history shows that a council may fail to be recognized as ecumenical when it fails to become part of the conscience of the people, for the people must acknowledge it and make its provisions their own. The supreme organ of infallibility is therefore the entire body of Christ, as soon as the people embrace the pronouncements of the council."<sup>12</sup> Reception by the people of God (*laos*) in actuality is the act of synthesizing universality and catholicity.

In practice, the reception of a council like Nicaea is a spiritual process that contains by its very nature a degree of openness. It is subject to the leading of the Holy Spirit. From the viewpoint of those attending the council, it is the pneumatic centeredness rather than the imperial injunction which serves as the theological basis for the council's authority. The delegates at the council "understood themselves increasingly as an instrument of the Holy Spirit, as a voice which therefore must be heard."<sup>13</sup> Reception by the *whole church* gave the council its ecumenical recognition as in the case of Nicaea. Reception then is not something added externally to the inner pneumatic authority of council, but rather confirms it. An ecumenical council, in other words, "is a council which has been recognized by the church scattered throughout the world."<sup>14</sup>

Finally, let us consider the criteria for the reception of a council, especially with regard to dogmatic decisions. The test of reception is whether or not the council held fast to the ancient apostolic tradition against new heresies, as in the case of the Arians at Nicaea. The Orthodox are quite adamant on this point. According to the Orthodox, "The ecumenicity of a council is determined neither by the number of the participating bishops, nor by the subsequent confirmation of the bishops of Rome as Catholics claim. There is only an internal criterion: the teaching must

---

<sup>12</sup> Margull, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-9.

<sup>13</sup> Faith and Order Report, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

be in absolute harmony with what the church has always believed and taught."<sup>15</sup> Admittedly non-theological factors are involved in the entire conciliar process including reception, but ultimately reception is a spiritual process which affirms the apostolic tradition. Proof of its spirituality lies precisely in "the long process of critical appropriation which both preceded the formal reception and followed it. Reception as a spiritual event corresponds to the council's claim to be the voice of the Holy Spirit. This presupposes that the same spirit of God who leads to all truth by witnessing to Jesus, the incarnate Word of God, is at work both in the council and the church as a whole."<sup>16</sup> Thus the factor of reception is not to be taken lightly when considering the reasons behind the priority given to the Council of Nicaea as the prototype of an ecumenical council. The Christian church had shifted considerably in its global status from the modest beginnings of the initial apostolic gathering in Jerusalem.

### *Councils and Issues of Vatican II*

We have already mentioned the Arian controversy which surrounded the Council of Nicaea, thus causing a continuation of councils and issues to date. Not all the issues or councils will be dealt with here, but a sufficient number to indicate the contemporary ambiguity which permeates the status of ecumenical councils from both Eastern and Western viewpoints.

Following the Council of Nicaea, the succeeding councils defined and clarified the dogma of the church resulting (for good or ill) in the further fragmentation of the *Corpus Christianum*. The criteria for the ecumenicity and acceptance of any particular council were not universally shared by all those in Christendom. The Arians were finally severed from the wider fellowship of Christians at the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. The Nestorians were ousted following the Third Ecumenical Council at Ephesus in 431 A.D. The Oriental Orthodox

---

<sup>15</sup> Margull, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

<sup>16</sup> F. & O. Report, *op. cit.*, p. 11. Bela Vassady points out that the whole church is steadily in the process of conciliation even without the convoking of an ecumenical council. The leading of the Holy Spirit is not bound to a council; it is a charismatic gift offered to the whole church at all times. ("Revelation, Scripture and Tradition," *Theology and Life*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1966.) I believe the church fathers at Nicaea would concur with Vassady's observation.

Churches (sometimes incorrectly called "monophysites") were alienated at the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. The Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils at Constantinople (553 and 680-1 A.D. respectively) stand in the shadow of Chalcedon further defining Christology and condemning aspects of Nestorianism and monophysitism in its related form of monothelitism. The Seventh Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 787 A.D. is the last council of an "ecumenical stature" from the viewpoint of Byzantine Orthodoxy. It concerned itself with the problem of iconoclasm and declared itself strongly in favor of the veneration of images (icons). Latin Christendom (the Roman Church) continued to take the initiative in holding ecumenical councils, numbering them consecutively from the first seven, until we recently arrived at the twenty-first ecumenical council, better known to the world as Vatican II. From this cursory survey, the evident fragmentation of the *Corpus Christianum* from a conciliar viewpoint can be sharply seen.

It can be quickly surmised that the ecumenical councils were perhaps a greater source of division than of unity. Such a surface appraisal would be incorrect. In what sense then can these councils be regarded as ecumenical, having a universal validity for all of Christendom? It appears that ecumenical councils have become identified with the practice of exclusion resulting in a fragmented Christendom which produced a kind of regionalism with Byzantine, Oriental, and Latin leanings. Each region ('region' implying a common sharing of theological content rather than a geographic area) does not share the ecumenicity of the other in its entirety. This factor adds to the ambiguity and confusion surrounding the question of councils.

For example, one criterion for the ecumenicity of a council in the Latin ecclesiastical world is that the power to summon an ecumenical council resides with the pope. In the Greek East, such authority has resided with the state. In practice, however, such theological orientations of papal and imperial authority are much more complex. While all the early councils were indeed called by emperors, this factor does not explain why other synods or councils called by emperors during the same period were later rejected, "such as those of 449 and 754, or the Second Trullan Council, which specifically described itself as ecumenical but which was recognized only in the East. On the other hand, the council of 381, which was not attended by representatives of the West, was

nevertheless recognized by the West later, while the papal synod of Martin I (649) did not attain recognition."<sup>17</sup> The regional orientations of the Greek East (imperial) and Latin West (papal) influence and compound the confusion regarding any easy theory to decipher the necessary bases upon which councils are considered ecumenical.

For instance, Francis Dvornik, the distinguished Roman Catholic scholar on Byzantine Orthodoxy, has studied the validity of the so-called Eighth Ecumenical Council (869-70), the last ecumenical council to be held in the East. Here is an example for our examination. This council concerned itself with the controversy of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in his struggle with the papacy. The culmination of the struggle was the condemnation of Patriarch Photius as a usurper of the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and the reinstatement of St. Ignatius in his stead at the Synod of 869-70. This council was later added to the seven ecumenical councils and called the Eighth Ecumenical Council by the Roman Church. "This Council called itself ecumenical because it was convoked by an Emperor — Basil I — as were all previous ecumenical councils. The invitations to assist at it were addressed to the bishops of the Empire and it was attended by the representative of Pope Hadrian II and four other Patriarchs. In spite of this it was opened in the presence of only twelve bishops, and its Acts were signed by only the one hundred and ten Fathers who had responded to the repeated exhortations of the Emperor to appear at its sessions. The reason for this meagre attendance was that the great majority of Byzantine prelates considered the accusation launched against Photius as unjust, since he had been canonically elected by a local synod after the resignation of Ignatius in 856. Because the majority of the clergy had ignored the decisions of this Council Ignatius had difficulties in the administration of his patriarchate. Fortunately, this situation was cleared up when the Emperor brought Photius back from exile and entrusted him with the education of his sons. Then both Ignatius and Photius were reconciled."<sup>18</sup> This was not the

---

<sup>17</sup> Margull, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

<sup>18</sup> F. Dvornik, "Which Councils Are Ecumenical?", *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 3 (1966), p. 315. See also, Alexander A. Bogolapov, "Which Councils Are Recognized As Ecumenical?", *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (1963), pp. 54-72.

end of the episode. The Byzantine Church needed healing within itself and also reconciliation with the papacy.

Another council was planned for the purpose of reconciliation on all sides. "The Emperor and Ignatius asked Pope John VIII to send his representatives to the new council. Unfortunately, before the Papal legates reached Constantinople, Ignatius died, and Photius was reinstated as Patriarch. The Council took place in November of 879 and ended in March, 880. Photius was reinstated by the numerous conciliar Fathers with the assent of the papal legates and the representatives of the other Patriarchs. The Council of 869-870 which had condemned Photius and his followers was abrogated."<sup>19</sup> Why then does the Roman Church continue to this day to count a council which has been abrogated as ecumenical? This is an embarrassing question for Dvornik in his quest for truth and for cordiality with Byzantine Orthodoxy. Acquaintance with Orthodoxy would inform any Western observer, Protestant or Roman Catholic, that Orthodoxy gives great honor to the first seven ecumenical councils. Orthodoxy considers herself as the Church of the Councils.<sup>20</sup> In fact, Greek Uniates at a later date attempted to regard the Councils of Lyons (1274) and especially that of Florence (1438-9) as the Eighth Ecumenical Council unsuccessfully.

How then did the Western Church abandon this earlier tradition of seven ecumenical councils which it shared with Byzantine Orthodoxy by adding the synod (or council) of 869-70 as the Eighth Ecumenical Council which subsequent history invalidated? Dvornik through his scholarly studies suggests that the recognition by the Roman Church of the Ignatian Council as the Eighth Ecumenical Council was due to the influence of a hidden agenda during the reign of Pope Gregory VII, "who opened the Lateran archives to his canonists who were looking for new arguments for the papal primacy and who were against the interven-

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> Schmemmann comments, however, that in Orthodoxy no theological definition of a council has thus far been commonly accepted. Furthermore, from an Orthodox standpoint, there is not one, but several patterns of councils which differ in many respects substantially from one another. The basic question remains: "What is a council and how does it reflect the conciliary nature of the Church herself?" ("Towards a Theology of Councils," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 4 [1962], p. 173).

tion of laymen in the appointment of bishops and abbots. They needed a strongly worded official document which they could use in their fight against the investiture, or appointment of clergy to ecclesiastical dignities by influential laymen. They found such a document in Canon twenty-two voted by the Ignatian Council, which forbade laymen to influence the appointment of prelates."<sup>21</sup> It should be recalled that Photius had unusual power in his lay status prior to his rapid rise into the clerical hierarchy.

Such power in the laity was a threat to the papacy and its sovereignty in the choice of prelates. "All canonists and reformists of the Gregorian period used this canon as their most powerful weapon in their struggle for the freedom of the Church in the election of prelates. To give more weight to this argument, they promoted the Ignatian Council to one of the most important ecumenical synods, overlooking the Acts of the Photian Council which had cancelled the Council of 869-70, although the Acts of this council were also kept in the Lateran Archives."<sup>22</sup> In short, it appears that Roman canonists found this council an effective weapon in their struggle to strengthen the papacy. Thus the Council of 869-70 which had been cancelled, began to be numbered among the ecumenical councils as the Eighth Council at the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth centuries.

Dvornik has done us a service in tracing the strange development leading to the acceptance of the Ignatian Council of 869-70 as an ecumenical council, despite the fact that nothing is known of any official decree in the life of the Roman Church giving the status "ecumenical" to the council. Dvornik concludes that a seemingly extraordinary oversight on the part of the eleventh century canonists led to the elevation of the Ignatian Council into becoming the Eighth Ecumenical Council. From the Roman standpoint, this clearly illustrates that the East and West were in perfect accord regarding the numbering of the councils until the twelfth century.

Turning from the Orthodox-Catholic dialogue on the numbering the ecumenical councils, there is a parallel discussion and debate over the ecumenicity of the Council of Trent between Prot-

---

<sup>21</sup> Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* See also Ludvik Nemec, "Photius — Saint or Schismatic?", *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 3 (1966), pp. 277-313.

estants and Catholics. The Council of Trent (1545-63) is regarded as the nineteenth ecumenical council by the Roman Church. Trent issued many doctrinal and disciplinary decrees as a corrective to the Protestant Reformation. The Roman canonists at the time were interested in seeing that the documents issued from Trent would receive ecumenical status. Strengthening the papacy against the spirit of conciliarism which Protestants and Orthodox favored, was another motivation behind Trent even though the papacy had already triumphed over the conciliarist attempts at the council of Basel, Ferrara, and Florence (1431-1442). Today, the speculative question has been raised: If the conciliar spirit had prevailed in the Roman Church, would further fragmentation within Western Christendom have been avoided?

Hubert Jedin, in his scholarly study on the ecumenical councils has suggested that there was only one way to counteract to further disintegration of Western Christendom and that was to hold a council during the decisive years of the Reformation (1521-1525). As early as 1524, the Emperor Charles V significantly proposed the convocation of a general council in the little town of Trent, but Pope Clement VII was opposed at that time to holding any council. Such are the ironies of history! "It is indeed hard to visualize the course of the reformation that would have ensued if a council had actually been held during those years. It may be that there would have been bitter controversy between the council and Luther, who had declared at Worms that he could not believe in 'councils alone' inasmuch as they did not represent a unanimous tradition. But it is equally probable that the convening of a council in those years of decision would have prevented the final rupture of Western Christendom, and the outbreak of the Peasants' War and other radical reform movements might have been made impossible. It is likely that a council held at so early a date would have been in a position to prevent the struggles that actually took place later by clarifying such questions as the proper relationships between papal and episcopal power and between the spiritual authority of the church and the episcopal power and between the spiritual authority of the church and the actual administrative

---

<sup>28</sup> Margull, *op. cit.*, pp. 252-3. See also H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent I* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957), especially pp. 192-218.

power of its highest tribunals."<sup>23</sup> In the end, the spirit of suspicion rather than conciliarity had its sway in the papacy.

In spite of the outcome, the Reformers continued to advocate a conciliar approach, placing great emphasis upon the first four councils and subjecting all conciliar pronouncements to the testimony of Scripture. Luther and Calvin viewed the distinguishing characteristic of conciliarism as the idea of an *ecclesia repraesentativa*. They saw it as the community of believers meeting together in mutual harmony. Their views were very similar to the Orthodox view of *sobornost'* (a fraternal fellowship in unity). For the reformers, all the People of God should be represented in the council — bishops, priests, and laity. The distinguishing feature of conciliarism "is that the church is understood as the community of believers. The authority inherent in the church is exercised through the council where all believers are represented, partly by their bishops and clergy, partly by the laity present. Thus the general council appears as representative of the fullness of spiritual power resident in the church as a whole. Hence the council has the right to judge the pope: it can fill the papal office, even in matters of dogma its teaching authority is superior to that of the pope."<sup>24</sup> Of course, conciliarism interpreted in these terms was opposed to the papacy and the Council of Trent in the latter's subordinate relationship to the pope. The Reformers, therefore refused the extended invitation to attend the council. The absence of the Protestants, however, did not deter the Roman canonists from adding Trent to the list of ecumenical councils. In actuality the ecumenicity of the Council of Trent sought opposition rather than reconciliation, and became known as the Council of the Counter-Reformation. Beginning with the Second Vatican Council, (for the First Vatican Council was but a further extension of the dogmatic labors of Trent) the twenty-first ecumenical council for the Roman Church, has the climate now been set for Protestants, Orthodox, and Catholics to strive together toward constructing a mutually shared theology for future ecumenical councils.

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 243. John Calvin made his feelings quite explicit with regard to the proper line of authority in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. II, Book IV.



### *Toward a Theology of Councils*

It is evident that no official list of recognized ecumenical councils will be satisfying to all church traditions in the East or the West. We can count as many as twenty-one Councils if we are Roman Catholics and zero if we are contemporary Arians, with an interesting and varying range of two for Nestorians, three for the Oriental Orthodox, four for the Reformers and seven for the Byzantine Orthodox.<sup>25</sup> Also, note that the ante-Nicene synods were called by bishops of local churches without the functionary aid of the state. In fact, the Council of Nicaea summoned by Constantine constituted in itself an innovation. This observation does not take away from the significance of Nicaea, but rather should highlight in our search for a theology of councils that the early church in the first three decisive centuries of the church actually managed without "ecumenical councils" (this fact should humble any Christian tradition claiming ecumenicity for a council). Finally, let it be said that the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-29) which served later as the primitive prototype for Nicaea announced its decision in a pneumatic spirit . . . "For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us . . ." (v. 28). These remarks should be kept in mind along with the characteristics of universality, unity, and catholicity noted in reference to the Council of Nicaea as we move toward a theology of councils for the future.

A realistic ecumenism looking to the future will not be satisfied with less than an ecumenical council that can be shared by the entire *oikoumene* of Christians. The Council of Nicaea came the closest to achieving this goal, and hence its honorary priority in all quarters of the Christian *oikoumene*. The Second Vatican Council recently proclaimed itself from a Roman standpoint to be "ecumenical." However, almost one-half of the Christian *oikoumene* could not officially *vote* in its proceedings (in spite of considerable influence which Protestant and Orthodox *observers* had upon the council). "In reality, therefore," according to Ro-

---

<sup>25</sup> See Hans Kung, *Structures of the Church* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964); Nikos A. Nissiotis, "Orthodox Reflections on the Decree on Ecumenism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1966), pp. 329-42; and especially in regard to the Oriental and Byzantine Christians, *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, X, 2 (1964-5), devoted to the unofficial consultation between theologians of "Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches."

man Catholic theologian Hans Kung, Vatican II "is not an ecumenical council, but a Roman Catholic council,"<sup>26</sup> Given this awareness, Kung rightly surmises that the full factual ecumenical credibility of a council in the future "cannot be established by theoretical arguments, but only by the reunion of separated Christians. This can be achieved only if a future council should again really represent the whole *oikumene* and gain the recognition of the whole *oikumene*. It may take a long, an unbearably long time, before this comes to pass. But what is decisive today is that the first step has been taken in this direction. By the epoch-making fact of orienting the Second Vatican Council toward the goal of reunion, John XXIII has not only aroused great hopes; he has also greatly strengthened the ecumenical credibility of this council."<sup>27</sup> With this cautionary note of realism in mind lest we become ecumenically impatient with one another, let us proceed to give two necessary theological criteria or categories which must be seriously considered in planning a council in the future.

The first is the theological criterion of *reception*. Reception (we have already noted) is an open-ended process and not subject to any rigid procedure. By reception we imply the process by which churches and their traditions "accept the decision of a council and thereby recognize its authority. Such reception refers only to the conciliar decisions and does not necessarily include a position toward the proceedings during the council by which they came into being. Naturally, however, a refusal of reception can be based on the judgment that the council was illegal or, especially, that it did not hold to the norms of preserving apostolic tradition."<sup>28</sup> From the standpoint of the *oikoumene*, an ecumenical council is one that has been received and recognized by Christian churches wherever they exist.

Reception implies more than mathematical unanimity; it may even reside with a minority, but above all it centers on a common search for the mind of the spirit. Reception is a spiritual process under the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, the universal bishop of the *oikoumene*. "An ecumenical council is not a democratic parliament in which it is merely a matter of producing a

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>28</sup> Faith and Order Report, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

majority, even a slim one, for or against a decision. Rather, an ecumenical council is the representation of the Church and her unity, which can be credibly expressed only in the unanimity of decisions effected by the Spirit. It is not in the large 'fraction' that the Holy Spirit of unity manifests His presence but in the concord of all."<sup>29</sup> Reception points above all to a pneumatic consensus among the Christian churches.

A pneumatic consensus must be achieved sooner or later if an ecumenical council in the future is to be authoritative for the *oikoumene*. "Should it not be achieved, it would then be a sign that the council does not represent the ecumenical Church in her fullness. Unanimity and fellowship are the work of the Holy Spirit (see II Cor. 13:13, *koinonia*). In order to grasp the deeper meaning of councils we must take into consideration the Holy Spirit as a decisive personage. Councils always call themselves assemblies in the Holy Spirit at which Christ invisibly presides (sometimes this presence of Christ is concretely represented by a picture of Christ, or better still by Holy Scripture, which lies open on an altar). The passage in Matthew (18:20), which holds out the promise of the presence of the Lord wherever the Church is gathered in harmony and brotherhood, is always quoted. Thus time and again what the first Christian testimony states about the councils of the Church must always be realized anew: ". . . the representation of the whole of Christendom is celebrated with great veneration. How worthy of a guiding faith that this council be gathered from all places for Christ! Behold, how good and joyful it is when brethren dwell together!"<sup>30</sup> This then is the first necessary theological criterion for a future ecumenical council: reception by means of a pneumatic consensus.

The second of these suggested twofold theological criteria is the need for *continuity*. Reception by means of a pneumatic consensus will always keep the door open for change under the lead-

---

<sup>29</sup> Kung, *op. cit.*, p. 32. "Naturally no one who reckons with a council by human convocation will expect mathematical unanimity; two bishops refused to affix their signatures even at the first ecumenical council." (*Ibid.*, p. 35.)

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39. The quoted remarks refer to Yves Congar, "Die Konsilien in Leben der Kirche," *Una Sancta* 14 (1955), p. 162; and Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* 13, 6-7; *Corpus Christianorum seu nove Patrum collectio*, II, 1272.

ing of the Spirit, but there is also the task of discerning the spirits, hence the theological requirement for continuity. The criterion for continuity is an acknowledgement that any future ecumenical council must be biblical in content and apostolic in character. Anything less than this would not have the quality of catholicity to merit the distinction of being known as an ecumenical council by the churches.

Within the very nature of a council, there will exist a constant tension between continuity and change, between reception and revelation, as the churches search for the mind of Christ in their day. The inevitable tension is actually an essential function of an ecumenical council. The tension implies that the council constitutes the ecclesiastical authority to correctly interpret Scripture and tradition; at the same time the council itself is also subject to the authority of Scripture and tradition. It is precisely at this point that the Council of Nicaea serves as the most creative model for an ecumenical council of the People of God.

At Nicaea, "Matters were not to be settled by some kind of scholarly predilections and political tendencies, nor by any kind of fanciful philosophy or fanciful theology, nor by any kind of scholastic theses or scholastic systems, nor by any national university or monastic tradition, but by the word of God in the holy writings of the Old and New Testaments. Can what Athanasius said about the Fathers of Nicaea 'breathing Holy Scripture' be said about the Fathers of *all* councils? We cannot overlook the fact that the closeness to Scripture of individual councils has been very different. There was a great difference between Nicaea, where it was primarily a question of the interpretation of Scripture, and the later post-Chalcedon councils where it was often primarily a question of seeing who could forge the longest chain of proofs for his argument, made up of quotations from the Fathers."<sup>81</sup> As in the case of Nicaea, any future ecumenical council must also take the *responsible risk* of re-interpreting the truth inherent in the biblical revelation and transmitted through the respective Christian traditions. These truths must then be placed into the idioms of tomorrow's *laos*.

Use of these theological criteria will provide valuable guidelines, hopefully, to future ecumenical councils in which all Chris-

---

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

tian churches may participate. When the criteria or reception by means of a pneumatic consensus, and of continuity by means of Scripture and tradition are made to converge upon each other, the result will be a creative tension through which the churches will have the opportunity to discern more clearly the bidding of the Spirit.

UNIVERSITY OF DUBUQUE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.